

## Original Paper

# The Evolution of Environmental Ethics in the Anglican Church

Bbosa Esau Kimanje<sup>1</sup>, Kizito Michael George<sup>1</sup> & Ssebunya Margaret<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Religious Studies and Philosophy, Kyambogo University, Kyambogo, Uganda

\* Bbosa Esau Kimanje, Kizito Michael George, Ssebunya Margaret, Department of Religious Studies and Philosophy, Kyambogo University, P.O Box 1, Kyambogo, Uganda

Received: November 19, 2024 Accepted: December 5, 2024 Online Published: December 30, 2024

doi:10.22158/jrph.v8n1p1

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.22158/jrph.v8n1p1>

### Abstract

*This paper aims to establish the evolution of environmental ethics in the Anglican Church. The paper employs a critical analysis of existing literature using the interpretivist paradigm. Interpretivism focuses on describing meaningful social action and gaining an in-depth understanding of the phenomenon under study. In this study, phenomenological description was applied to understand the evolution of environmental ethics in the Anglican Church through a detailed exploration of individuals' experiences. Although many philosophers have contributed different philosophical perspectives on the environmental ethics, there is a need to also consider the evolution of environmental ethics from a theological perspective. Theologians and ethicists have been inspired to look for another perspective from the scriptures and theology which can enable the ecological sustainability and environmental ethics in the natural world which experiences rapid destruction and dilapidation. This study therefore is a critical exploration on how the Anglican Church has positioned itself in relation to the environmental ethics debate.*

### Keywords

*Anglican Church, Environmental ethics, evolution*

## 1. Introduction

Ideally, the Anglican Church should divinely be at the forefront of contributing to environmental ethics through preaching in word and action, the gospel of environmental stewardship and justice (Brennan & Yeuk-Sze, 2008; Keller, 2010). Though, it should be the Anglican Church's mandate as a steward to alleviate environmental crises, it has not adhered to its mandate of teaching environmental ethics. Due to the fact that the followers have not been taught well, they have caused deforestation, land degradation, wetland encroachment, and water and air pollution. There is high socio-economic, institutional, technological, and moral interplay as the Church fails in the process to do what is right and ends up doing

what is contrary to environmental ethics. This has resulted in an environmental catastrophes such as loss of biodiversity (Jamieson, 2008). This paper presents the evolution of environmental ethics in the Anglican Church. It begins by discussing the evolution of environmental ethics from a broader perspective before finally tackling the Anglican Church's context.

## 2. Method

Concepts were reviewed in detail with the aid of themes in this investigation as the relationships between the variables were identified. Data was collected through majorly document review and analysis. Documents used to collect data included: Church Environment policy, Church minutes on environment, Church conference reports on environment, Newspapers articles, research reports, theses, online information, journals on environment, and text books. From the above documents, the study generated information that gave a broader perspective of the research questions and concepts for this study (Saunders, Lewis, & Thornhill, 2012).

## 3. Results

### 3.1 *The Broad Evolution of Environmental Ethics*

As the Anglican Church is not in isolation, but it is found in an environment comprised of different entities, it pertinent to first review how environmental ethics has evolved at the broad scene. This helps to draw some important lessons which are valuable to the current study.

Environmental ethics is a branch of ethics that aims at understanding holistically the relationship that exists between humans and the natural environment in which humans live. It is a discipline that envisages an understanding and evaluation of the human moral duty to promote and protect the environment (Bookchin, 2001, p. 44). Through environmental ethics, both human interests and the environment are brought together in recognition that they are interdependent with common intrinsic values. Among the theories of environmental ethics are deep ecology and environmental stewardship which offer a theoretical basis for this study.

Environmental ethics emerged in the early 1970s when philosophers started to consider a newly discovered sub-discipline that focuses on the philosophical implications of environmental problems. Previously, the ethical discussions focused on interactions among humans whose emphasis significantly was on justice, happiness, rights, and obligations.

The arrival of environmental ethics harbingered a principal drift, bolstering ethical attentiveness above our fellow humans to include non-human creatures in the natural world, such as the planet, plants, animals, and the ecosystem. This drift landed broadly as a result of burgeoning awareness of the human concussion on the environment, motivated by episodes such as the dissemination of Rachel Carson's "Silent Spring" in 1962, which disclosed the destructive aftermaths of pesticides on birds' existence. In her book, Carson discusses how humanity has abused the environment by using pesticides and other harmful chemicals like DDT. She argues that such harmful interference with the environment has led to

the contamination of the food chain with chemicals, causing genetic damage and cancer among other issues. Carson's toil activated an environmental development that thereafter directed the formulation of the United States Environmental Protection Agency (Desjardins, 2001, p. 74). Of similar significance was Paul Ehrlich's 1968 book, *The Population Bomb*, which warned of the devastating effects of a spiraling human population on the planet's resources. It can be commented that the exhaustion of natural resources and environmental pollution are not the only ones on the list of environmental issues, other issues like the degradation of the ecosystem, the destruction of biodiversity, and change in climate are also great concerns of the environment that should be considered publically (Desjardins, 2001, p. 74). Environmental ethics is concerned with spelling out the human moral duties pertaining the environmental issues. Concisely, the two basic questions that should be addressed by environmental ethics are: what are the human obligations as far as the environment is concerned, and why? The last question should be given priority over the first one because it seeks to handle first why we are obliged and not just what are our obligations. A consideration can be given to this example, are our environmental obligations intended for the humanity of today, for humanity to come, or for all creations not considering how humanity benefits? Various philosophers have deliberated intensively to come up with a solution to this important question, which has also resulted in the advent of a variety of environmental ethics discourses (Boylan, 2001, p. 81).

In the year 1970, the first Earth Day became an inspiration for environmental ethics, as the environmentalists then began encouraging philosophers whose interests were in the environment to take action concerning environmental ethics. There had been an emergence of climate of intellectuals who had cropped up in the previous years of the 1960s in big numbers as a result of publishing two papers. These papers were "The Historical Roots of our Ecological Crisis" in March 1967 by Lynn White and "The Tragedy of the Commons" in December 1968 by Garrett Hardin (Boylan, 2001, p. 2). By then there was an increased awareness of the effects of technology, industry, economic, and population growth on the environment. Lynn White argued that the ecological crisis was a culmination of Western Christianity's anthropocentrism blended with the 19<sup>th</sup> -century invention of science and technology. Garrett Hardin in his theory argued that finite resources, like forests, clean water, clean air, and fisheries used in common will unavoidably reduce into ruin as long as the use is unchecked (Gewirth, 2001, pp. 207-211).

Aldo Leopold published an essay titled "The Land Ethic" which became the most influential regarding the two schools of thought. Leopold argued that the ecological crisis had philosophical roots. Much as Leopold's essay was a publication of 1949, that became popularly displayed in 1970 in a special Club or Ballantine edition, with other essays from a second book, *Round River*. The "land ethics" of Leopold requires that we should cease managing the land as just a bare object or resource. According to Leopold, land is not just barely soil. Rather, the land is a powerhouse from which flows an orbit of soil, plants, and animals. Although food orders direct the energy uphill out of the soil, death, and decomposition reimburse the energy back to the soil. Consequently, the discharge of energy depends on an intricate

framework of relations among organisms (Bookchin, 2001, p. 75). Even though evolution slowly alters these relations, it is contended by Leopold that man's go-between has been considerably more brutal and disastrous. In order to maintain the liaisons into the land, it is opined by Leopold that we must commit ourselves to the "land ethic", by allowing moral positioning to the land colony itself, not merely its solo sections. This results in Leopold's popular ethical directive: "A thing is right when it tends to preserve the integrity, stability, and beauty of the biotic community. It is wrong when it tends otherwise" (Leopold, 1989, pp. 218-225).

Academic debates focused mostly on the two publications by Lynn White and Garret Hardin, "The Historical Roots of our Ecological Crisis" and "The Tragedy of the Commons" respectively in the 1970s. The debates emphasized historical, theological, and religious aspects, but ignored the philosophical dimension. For many years, philosophers kept wondering what the field of environmental ethics would be like. At the University of Georgia, William Blackstone in the year 1972 came up with the first philosophical conference. In the year 1974, what resulted from this conference was published in the form of *Philosophy and Environmental Crisis* and this brought about the first publication of Pete Gunter known as the "The Big Thicket" (Gewirth, 2001, p. 209).

In 1972, John B. Cobb disseminated a book titled "Is it Too Late? A Theology of Ecology". This book was the first issue written by a philosopher, much as it focused on the theological and religious aspects. The following year 1973 Richard Routley who was a philosopher from Australia, appeared at the 15<sup>th</sup> World Congress of Philosophy with a paper to present, titled "Is there a Need for a New, an Environmental Ethic?". Routley's paper was challenged by a fellow Australian Philosopher John Passmore the following year 1974, in the paper "Man's Responsibility for Nature. Passmore argued in reaction to Routley's paper that, he finds no need for environmental ethics at all in Routley's paper. The Philosophers focused on challenging Passmore's argument for almost a decade in their debates till the mid-1980s (Robert & Pettit, 1995, pp. 471-488). The birth of an Ethics paper in a publication titled "Is There an Ecological Ethic?" by Holmes Rolston in 1975 aroused the mainstream attention of the philosophy of environmental ethics.

The year 1973 marked the birth of the Deep Ecology Movement founded by philosopher Arne Naess from Norway, the founder and an editor of *The Journal of Inquiry*. In this Journal, Naess wrote and published a paper "The Shallow and Deep, Long-Range Ecology Movement". Writers like Bill DeVall, Warwick Fox and George Sessions, sometimes Max Oelschlaeger were very instrumental writers of the Deep Ecology Movement (Gnanakan, 2004, p. 20).

All through in the 1970s, the basic philosophical journal that provided papers on environmental ethics was the *Journal of Inquiry*. By then, the mainstream philosophy journals barely produced articles on environmental ethics annually, as it was mostly taken as officiousness. However, doors of opportunities were opened dramatically in 1979 with Eugene C. Hargrove establishing *The Journal of Environmental Ethics*. The Journal was named specifically the name of its field.

The early five years of *The Journal of Environmental Ethics* were characterized mostly by arguments concerning rights for nature and interrelatedness with environmental ethics together with animal rights or animal liberation. The aspect of rights was lost, whereas that of animal welfare ethics came on board and was distinguished as an independent field. I presume that the reason behind this argument was that animal welfare is pertinent to environmental ethics because animals live within the natural environment, and therefore, fashion segments of environmentalists' engrossed state of mind. However, protracting moral execution to animals besides, steers to the conceptualization of specific kinds of environmental trusts. Fundamentally, this ethics demands that in considering how the human undertakings impact on the environment, evaluation should not just focus on how these upset only human's present and future, rather, also the arousal and rights of animals. For example, clearing a virgin forest might be beneficial to humanity in all terms, however, the animals' ethics is affected and therefore, their lives are exposed to danger (Gnanakan, 2004, p. 122). This means that the animal life within and around this forest must be put in consideration.

In the early 1980s, John B. Cobb co-authored and published with Charles Birch another book "The Liberation of Life". A philosophical approach was undertaken by this book according to Alfred North Whitehead's philosophy of organisms. A book that responded fully to Passmore's argument known as "The Ethics of Environmental Concern" was published by a philosopher from Wales known as Robin Attfield. Donald Scherer in the company of Tom Attig edited the mentioned book which comprised an anthology of papers on Ethics and the Environment.

In the year 1988, came a shift as it dawned availability of a variety of single-authored books, like *Respect for Nature* by Paul Taylor, *Environmental Ethics* by Holmes Rolston, *The Economy of the Earth* by Mark Sagoff, and *Foundation of Environmental Ethics* by Eugene C. Hargrove. Meanwhile, in defending the Land Ethics, J. Baird Callicott made a collection of his papers. Other authors, like, Bryan Norton published their work titled *Why to Preserve Natural Diversity?* And they preceded it with *Toward Unity among Environmentalists*. Kristin Shrader-Frechette has also authored a variety of books on Economics and Environmental Policy.

In the 1980s, a new manifestation termed ecofeminism emerged. Karen Warren was behind this philosophical development. Nonetheless, different thinkers from varied backgrounds got interested in the ecofeminism evolution. Ecofeminism like Social Ecology, highlights a relationship that exists between social and natural world superiority. Ecofeminism advocates for the fanatical reconstruction of the predominant philosophical prospect and culture of Western society as deep ecology. Notwithstanding, ecofeminism has a wide following, with really a number of varied capacities that feminist scribes on environment held on. For this study only three most prominent scholars have been analyzed:

Val Plumwood criticizes the rationalism inborn in traditional ethics and condemns it for the injustice offered to both women and nature. The cardinal enigma of rationalism as observed by Plumwood was its promotion of dualisms. For example, reason itself always introduced in brunt disagreement to emotion. Plumwood contends that traditional ethics foster reason as suitable of furnishing a reliable base for moral

debate, by virtue of its equitability and generalizability. Emotion, on the contrary is insufficient of these attributes, and its foundation on feeling and passion makes a weak ethical base. Plumwood demands that this dualism between reason and emotions premises varied dualism in rationalist cognition: specifically, mind/body, human/nature, man/woman. For each set, the first is considered to be superior to the second (Plumwood, 1991, p. 101).

Thus, according to Plumwood, the lower status of the two women and nature own a similar root: that is to say rationalism. At one time this is appreciated, it is made vivid that simple extensionism as pointed out prior is inadequate to determine the supremacy of women and nature (Plumwood, 1991). Anyway, aforesaid extensionism is embedded in the similar mundane rationalist mind which is the exact root of the dilemma. What is required alternatively, as stated by Plumwood is, a confrontation to rationalism and in turn a challenge to the dualism it supports. All the same, even though it is perfectly probable to concede to rationalism as a predominant ethical thinking, however, it lies in one's power to interrogate Plumwood's depiction of it.

For all that, does rationalism essentially foster dualisms that are accountable for the enslavement of women and nature? Such a demand would be odd given the multitude of rationalist opinions that have been postulated to foster the rights and claims of the two, women and nature. Furthermore, numerous thinkers would contend that rationalist cognition is not the problem, but rather the outstanding assurance for ensuring appropriate concern for the environment and women. In the same manner, as contemplated above, such intellectuals hold that depending on the feelings and sentiments of individuals is an exorbitantly inconstant base on which to establish an essential ethical framework.

Karen J. Warren in his argument says that the dualism of rationalist thought as pointed out by Plumwood, are never fundamental problems. By preference, Warren argues that they tend to be problematic only when they are applied together with an 'onerous conceptual scheme' to validate subordination. According to Warren, one aspect intrinsic in an onerous conceptual scheme is the 'shrewdness of superiority' (Warren, 1990, p. 93). Consequently, a lineup of the variations between humans and nature, men and women, is under no circumstances detrimental. On the contrary at one time suppositions are supplemented like the differences prompting the moral dominance of humans and men, suddenly we advance nearer to the claim that we are showing to be true in subordinating women and nature on the premise of their lower status. Warren contends that merely the corresponding logic of domination has been common within Western society (Warren, 1990, p. 93). Men appear to be identified with the domain of the 'Mental' and 'human', on the other hand women appear to be identified with the 'physical' and the 'natural'. The moment the claim is that the 'physical' and the 'natural' are morally of lower status to the 'mental' and 'human, definitely, men turnout to be held as true in subordinating women and nature. According to Warren, suddenly feminists and environmentalists target at one goal: that is to say, to eliminate this onerous conceptual scheme.

Various ecofeminists chose to diverge away from Plumwood and Warren's advance. Instead of pinpointing the linkages that exist between the domination of women and nature, it would work better to

underscore those attributes that connect women and nature. It is argued that due to their capability to give birth, women are in more the same like the natural world. According to a number of ecofeminists, this puts women in peculiar perspective on building amicable liaison with natural world. In fact, various philosophers support a spiritualist advance where nature and women are offered a sacred value, reflecting behind the religious dimension where the earth is taken as female (Mies & Shiva, 1993, p. 76). For scribes like Plumwood, nonetheless, underscoring women's 'naturalness' frankly bolsters the dualism that results in women's oppression beforehand. Situating women nearer to nature, as it is argued by Plumwood, clearly situates them nearer to oppression. Those criticizing spiritualist advance contend that fostering spiritualist advance guides feminists to spin their focus inwards to themselves and their souls, by ignoring the women and nature they aim to liberate. Notwithstanding, regarding these arguments, ecofeminists may construct the very count as the deep ecologists. This can help to settle the environmental dilemma we interface, and the existing practices of domination. It only requires the cognizant and profound anticipation of individuals who are ready for a change.

The social ecology of Murray Bookchin was dropped to the third position. This was a very important connection between academics and fanatical environmentalists which was established by *The Trumpeter*, a Canadian deep ecology journal. In the most influential way in social ecologist Murry Bookchin's chronicles, dominance is the principal concept. According to Bookchin, the social problems are candidly linked to environmental problems (Bookchin, 1982, pp. 78-79). In addition, Bookchin specifies that within modern societies the prevailing rankings of command have promoted a stratified liaison between humans and the natural world (Bookchin, 1982, pp. 78-79). Such rankings have been facilitated by the ideology of the free market to dwindle both humanity and natural world to just goods. According to Bookchin, for both humans and nature to be liberated, one absolutely depends on the other. Consequently, Bookchin's submission is of a difference to Marxist's, whereby man's liberty depends on the total dominance of the nature via technology. According to social ecologists Bookchin, the Marxist reasoning holds the exact schism between humans and nature which is common in capitalist ideology. For social ecologists, there must be a recognition of nature by humans as they are part of it, so there must be no distinction or separation between the two. Successively then, the relations between humans and nature is acknowledged with no ranking in the natural world. Bookchin exemplifies it by pointing out that there must be no species more significant in the ecosystem than the others, likewise mutualism and interrelatedness must be exhibited in their relationships always. A blueprint without ranking within human society is provided for with this kind of interdependence and without hierarchy in nature (Bookchin, 2001).

Incontestable, the metamorphosis that Bookchin rallies is revolutionary. One wonders how the current non-ranking, mutualistic, and interrelated human society will be like. According to Bookchin, a distinct instrument of domination comes as a result of an all-powerful consolidated condition. Hence, for effective transformation without hierarchies to take place, must occur within the cell of the community. The aforementioned communities can thrive on sustainable agriculture, taking part in democracy, and

liberty through non-domination. Moreover, it is not only nature that facilitates the enrichment of equality among human communities, but also converted communities promote a favorable relationship with nature. The last count mirrors Bookchin's manifesting hope of human ability. Bookchin above all is not of the view that condemns humanity for generating ecological crisis, preferably the relationships within societies are condemned (Bookchin, 1991, p. 36). Due to this, Bookchin is exceedingly cautious of the inhuman and pessimistic arguments he feels to be common in the deep ecology.

One puzzle that has been detected in Bookchin's social ecology is his deduction from the natural world to human society. According to Bookchin, interdependence and without ranking within nature furnishes a base for non-ranking human societies (Bookchin, 1982, pp. 78-79). Nonetheless, as it was indicated when we focused on Aldo Leopold, it is a different thing to illustrate how nature is and how society has to be. Despite admitting that there are no natural hierarchies within nature, there are many different views that the majority of us would not want to promote in our human society. Take the example of feeble individuals and species that are always terminated, eaten, and suppressed in an ecosystem. This is a perfect natural mechanism and even qualified within the ecological depiction of nature as interlinked. All the same, should this establish human societies where the feeble are assassinated, eaten and suppressed? A view like such is found detestable to majority of us. Ensuing this order of argument, various brains have cautioned of the crises of depicting inferences concerning the manner society ought to be systematized from certain realities regarding the manner nature is (Dobson, 1995, p. 42)

There are some philosophers who have highlighted out a second dilemma from Bookchin's theory. For these philosophers, Bookchin's social ecology is anthropocentric, hence, insufficient in permitting the ground it merits. Proof of anthropocentrism is cited by critics from narratives of Bookchin's liberation of both humans and nature. According to Bookchin this emerging course cannot merely arise voluntarily, instead humans must expedite it. Absolutely, various philosophers are greatly skeptical of the same concept that history is irresistibly emerging pointing to a certain specific direction. On contrary, certain environmentalists are worried of the striking position that Bookchin offers to humans in promoting this unfolding. Definitely, the extent to which this is a problem counts on one's perspective. Despite everything, if humans are incapable of solving the environmental problems faced, is there significant reason of doing environmental ethics beforehand? Truly, Bookchin has been as a matter of choice at a loss by this assertion, and definitely denies that humans are merely a distinct community in nature. On the other side, he also denounces that nature exists solely for intents of humans. Nonetheless, the critics stand doubtful, and admit that this thinking that humans are in the know of what the emerging nature will appear like is excessive arrogance (Eckersley, 1992, pp. 154-156).

In 1989, a more popular environmental publication known as *Earth Ethics Quarterly* came into existence. Embryonically predetermined basically as a new edition of published work, now published by the Center for Life and Environment, its focus was more intended for international sustainable development.

At the University of Georgie in 1996, a fresh journal was set up known as *Ethics and the Environment* which was transformed into Indiana University Press in 2001. The year 1997 dawned with an



international association known as the International Association for Environmental Philosophy, putting more attention on environmental phenomenology. This association publishes a journal known as Environmental Philosophy.

Considering what was transpiring in the Environmental Philosophy, Taylor and Rolston looked at the theoretical level, much as they had many differences in their arguments, both can be viewed as objective non-anthropocentric intrinsic value theorists. Both Taylor and Rolston are bound by key assumptions render them unconvincing (Benson, 2001, p. 57). They both argue that intrinsic value is justly available in the environment and that humanity has an obligation to safeguard corresponding value. For each theory there is a tripod of criticisms. Firstly, the criticism dispenses with the manner of value attribution and the shift from values to moral tasks embedded in both Rolston's and Taylor's ethics. Secondary, there is apparent inconsistency in usage of human teleology in settling moral significance. Thirdly, the criticism shows where there are loopholes. So it can be concluded that the rationalist-deontological advance in environmental ethics as elucidated by Rolston and Taylor, must be declined (Benson, 2001, p. 57).

In the current book called *The Foundations of Environmental Ethics*, Hargrove who founded *The Journal of Environmental Ethics*, examines the social and philosophical attitudes in Western culture that relate to the environment; such as aesthetics, wildlife, and land use (Hargrove, 1989). The historical significance of the field is examined and a framework for further discussion is catered for. Hargrove makes environmental ethics clear and accessible to those new to the field and also fosters the understanding of those who are most familiar with it. Callicot commented that the work of Hargrove is effective and combines the scholarly sleuthing of a historian with the analytical acumen of a philosopher to produce a study unique in the field of environmental ethics. Hargrove's work is a monumental scholarly and philosophical achievement.

I conclude this section by echoing that Environmental Ethics is an approach that envisages an understanding and evaluation of human moral duty to promote and protect the environment. Through environmental ethics, we have seen the philosophers bringing together both humans' interests and the environment in recognition that they are interdependent of each other with common intrinsic value. There is a multitude of ethical theories, like deep ecology and environmental stewardship that are used to define environmental ethics. These environmental ethical theories lead to a theoretical framework that facilitates the understanding of the human moral duties to the environment and how the environment should be protected and promoted.

## 4. Discussion

### 4.1 *The Evolution of Environmental Ethics from Theological Perspective*

In the present era, theologians and ethicists have been led to look for another hand from the scriptures and theology in order to promote and protect ecological sustainability and environmental ethics. The biblical arguments in response to the ecology have facilitated the dawning of an eco-theology, which

has led to responsible stewardship. It is believed by some philosophers that the bible and its principles basically are intended for destruction of nature and they are believed to be the principle cause of ecological crisis (Spencer & White, 2007, p. 8). This view not only challenges the assumptions posed about the relation that exists between God and the world, created by His own hands and in His own likeness, but also call for notable contention between Christian theology and environmental ethics (Gnanakan, 2004, p. 74). Therefore, the biblical foundation for environmental promotion and protection requires to be intensely investigated in order to understand clearly the ecological linkage between Man and God. Both nature and humanity possess a lengthy documentary relation with Christianity. Focusing on environmental conservation, Christian Ecological ethics directs all consciousness on biblical, liturgical and spiritual practices.

The proposition in Genesis about stewardship indicates man's responsibility as stewardship other than ownership, confiding him the role of safeguarding nature from compromising policies and practices that may threaten the ecosystem as reflected by the *environmental stewardship theory, specifically the religious strain*. Given the Old Testament's books of prophecy, it is disclosed that nature has a major role in revealing God's purpose on Earth. When nature is destroyed, it symbolically signifies a deteriorating relationship that exists between humanity and God. The association between God, Man, and Nature prevails and is necessary. This section is intended to apply theological implications to environmental crisis, reflecting on the biblical and church customs and dogma looking at ecological terms, and bringing the scriptures into critical focus. This would enable us to explore and strengthen the unchanging and consistent relation between spirituality and cosmology.

Currently, the principal concern in society is environmental sustainability. Much as there was a generally sluggish response to Christianity in the 1980s and 90s, in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, this concern has been accelerated in all corners of the Church. Concerning *Deep Ecology*, two environmental adepts considered some eight principle current concerns that offer eco-tips, leading to enabled custom response in conjunction with Bible-underpinning considerations that intensify comprehension. Among the concerns sheltered are biodiversity, Climate Change, food and population, and the tie amidst environmental challenges are concerns linked to development in the world (Spencer & White, 2007, p. 18).

Considering Lynn White's fundamental article in the Science of 1967, titled "The Historical Roots of Our Ecological Crisis", academic and plain condemnation have been directed towards Christianity. The criticisms are in accusation of Christianity for hypothetically serving as a principal accelerator for the contemporary ecological crisis. Antithetical to White's pessimistic documentary narrative of the purpose of Christianity in environmental concerns, in this section, my approach is a refutation as I stress that Christianity is a key inception of wisdom regarding the establishment of better sustainable environmental stewardship (Desjardins, 2001, p. 75). The paramount blunder made by White was leaving out what Christianity teaches and generalizing what individual Christians envisage and do against the well-being of the environment. An explanation is given to this contradiction by Christianity. Christianity argues that people's right and wrong actions are exclusively the outcome of their free choice and fault as a result of

sin. It is not necessarily true that Judeo-Christian customs or the Bible are deficit of values and ethics that are openhearted to the environment. For all intent and purposes, White's arguments on the reciprocity amidst Christianity and Ecology are majorly misinformed, essentially due to his deficit of a profound scholarship on the biblical basis for environmental stewardship.

As it results in negative aftermath on health, existential plight, and the continuation of humanity, the pollution of the environment due to the influence of human activities on nature, is a global concern claiming combined endeavor from the global community. Pondering this fact, we argue in this paper that biblical ethics, notably as founded on the concepts of holiness, sanctification, stewardship, the golden rule, and interrelatedness, is important in advancing universal environmental wellness. We also argue in the same measure that the disregard of these concepts on which environmental ethics bases its existence presents universal environmental problems. Scrutinizing certain elemental scriptures, and employing conceptual and factual advances, this paper argues for the significance of embracing biblical ethics in overcoming universal environmental problems. For many centuries, various perspectives and elucidation on the concepts of holiness, sanctification, fellowship, and common existence, are spelled out in various scriptures, in affiliation to human operations and relationships. This paper audits the Judeo-Christian prospects of these concepts. The comprehension of Judeo-Christianity in presuming material and metaphysical aspects puts emphasis on the linkage of God and humanity while concretizing the need for responsive and responsible continuous community existence. Nonetheless, contemporary brains strive to sunder humanity from metaphysical being including God on basis of empirical rationale. This paper investigates the linking tag and the authority faith has in advancing environmental ethics and the need of operating with the concepts arising from faith ventures to ascertain universal environmental order. Therefore, this paper asserts that rendering enough heed to salient concepts of biblical principles can advance a healthy environment not only to humanity but the entire creation.

Currently, the universe is confronted with remarkable ecological havoc. Various environmentalists argue in terms of human stewardship of the environment as one instrument of overcoming the environmental crisis (Gnanakan, 2004). This reflection would be absolute for the Christian network to bear God's mission of salvaging nature, however, unluckily, the mode this stewardship is conceived and employed in the Church currently renders it all nonetheless futile. In this paper, we articulate considerable means to enlarge our comprehension of Christian Stewardship by reinforcing the scientific, historical, ethical and biblical bases of the concept. We presume to ignite debate regarding revamping the shape of stewardship as a pattern centred on God's design for the Christian mission to rejuvenate and salvage nature.

The contemporary environmental shift is only about forty years old, however, it is a cardinal universal shift. It has indisputably moved the universe, irrespective of educational, political, religious, economic or cultural confines. No skepticism can challenge the fact that environmentalism is one of the most significant current social episodes, presenting Christians an uncommon space for being salt and light in

communities all over the universe. The question is, what is being done in this respect? In this regard, We were challenged by a church leader who interrogated why among all studies, we had decided to take on environmental ethics? In his argument, he opined that everything was going to incinerate, “so just utilize the world so long as we possess it”. Unfortunately, hardheaded, profane and unresponsive advance displays a large spectrum among unadventurous evangelicalism. On the other side of the curtain, we find a cosmopolitan pantheistic convergence of events. As a way of fact, both ends present deficiency, lacking, and I contend to a certain angle unbiblical.

There is a necessity to change one’s mind in the view of nature. Failure to contribute a biblical rejoinder to this debate, erroneous articulations will be listened to. It is achievable to be engaged with the environment and reject to be a pantheist. Thus, the question that is intended to be answered is, “how can we salvage nature without worshipping it?” We opine that the answer must originate from the appropriate comprehension of the bilateral dependency amidst man, nature, as well as God. In this regard a special attention is directed to two biblical books Romans and Colossians chapters 8:19-22 and 1:15-20 respectively. On establishment of these principles, three important principle guidelines will be proposed to facilitate the development of biblical environmental ethical network.

The first bit in these principles explores God’s current work in creation and humanity’s liaison with nature. The second principle looks at elucidating a Christian concept of environment and development. The role of humans as stewards has become more complicated as a result of the fall. God never intended the fall and its aftermath for His creation, signifying that we must resist the fall in our role of stewardship and transpose its consequences. This implies that humanity must invent means of developing the environment and utilize carefully the natural resources therein provided by God for the present benefit and that of the future. This does not imply that pollution and other damages to the environment are eliminated. However, common sense and carrying on stewardship roles necessitate humanity to look for means that can develop the environment and utilize natural resources sustainably. There is a revelation by research on the ecological crisis that indicates its universal and absolute character, implying that in attempting to come up with solutions, varied views must be adhered to in order to take into consideration the global perspective. It is not amazing, hence, for many decades the scrutiny of the ecological crisis has been attempted by philosophers and religiologists who look up for means to configure an environmentally cordial heritage in varied religious customs. Nonetheless, the predominant thread looks on to Christianity and its purportedly anti-ecological mindset. There are various marks that attest to the fact that this affluent religious custom has considerable contribution in the campaign against the environmental crisis (Grewirth, 2001). This section of the paper intends to provide four Christian patterns of human liaisons with nature, which validate the grand ecological muscle of Christianity. These are the four patterns: Celtic animate, Benedictine, Nuptial of Hildegard of Bingen, and St. Francis fraternal pattern.

Picking a leaf from personal observation, this personal narrative finding identifies impediments and moments for involvement with environmental concerns in church-founded perspectives. The

impediments are wound up in four categories: Quintessential where involvement with the environment is denied; appositeness a skepticism about the proper extent of consciousness to provide to environmental concerns; censorious deficient alertness to cultural and social influences as they upset faith and environmental issues; and certainty belief for willingness to act positively. Moments are seen in three categories: Subcultural- which are social customs of faith in communities that may result in more effectual learning; responsibility- the sense of commitment, obligation, duty, and willingness to walk through the religious teaching; and overt theology a phase that assists effective involvement with the public discussion (Desjardins, 2001, p. 76).

It can be concluded from this section that there are reasons to accept that involvement of environmental ethics in Church oriented perspectives is very productive, more so, with a focus to such impediments and opportunities. So, by using a combination of the underpinning theories of environmental stewardship and deep ecology, without doubt, we provide comprehensive insights and possible solutions to the environmental issues that might be brought by humanity and the invented technology. The two theories provide the moral base for environmental promotion and protection. A mix of these theories would create a relational agenda that could come up with a lasting remedy to a number of environmental concerns that come as a result of human behavior.

#### *4.2 The Evolution of Environmental Ethics in the Anglican Church*

The Anglican Church worldwide has long been involved in environmental concerns. As a body that is universal and connected with an identity that is shared and goes beyond national borders, this Church has a unique perspective as far as environmental issues are concerned. The researchers have observed that the Anglican Church alone has been at the forefront of the emergencies brought on by climate change, so even engaged in coming up with climatic crisis solutions. The Anglican Communion has all along had the capacity to utilize its shared vision and identity in the mobilization of the Anglican networks calling for environmental justice and climate action.

Regarding uncertainty, the Anglican Church worldwide has been trying to develop skills to: adapt, mitigate, respond to disaster, prepare for disaster, develop resilience, and do advocacy. The Anglican Church has also been engaged in coming up with theological and spiritual resources that aid in behavioral and attitudinal changes crucial for their collective action as they address the environmental challenges. It can be observed that the Anglican Church has been a critical actor as far as environmental action and justice are concerned. The Anglican Church has also exemplified how to leverage its experience, expertise, and learning as it contributes to the global synergy in tackling climate change.

It was around 1970 that the evolution of environmental ethics emerged as stated in Joachim Radkau's environmental movement history known as "the Age of Ecology" (Barker & Bearce, 2013, pp. 45-59). This evolution has been comprised of events that have inspired conventionalist activities resulting in a mass movement. The Earth Day dawned in the year 1970 on 22<sup>nd</sup> April, much as it had been declared in 1963 by the Council of Europe. On this day, European Conservation and environmental concerns

appeared on National Magazines (Times and Der Spiegel) as a cover page. Much as the sacred spiritual side was ignored by choice in Radkau's study, in the "New Green Enlightenment", he recognizes it.

The year 1970 was also very crucial for Anglican roots as far as thinking about environmental ethics was concerned. In 1970 the first major report with the title "Man in his Living Environment" was made available by the Church of England Board for Social Responsibility. In this report, there was the full registration of the impact of environmental neglect. This report was formulated as a result of an invitation to the Board for Social Responsibility of the National Assembly of the Church of England. The invitation was intended for the church to make a presentation to the Ecumenical Conference on theological, philosophical, and ethical concerns on the conservation of the natural resources of land, air, water, and wildlife. There was hope that the report would help to come up with ethical, philosophical, and theological ways of natural resource conservation. This conference which was held in the Countryside was presided over by the Duke of Edinburgh. This Conference became a road map in the national campaign for political and religious awareness over environmental concerns. In an extensive study known as "Wildlife in Trust" by Tim Sand, the conservationist work's success is revealed (The Wildlife Trust, 2012).

The 1970 Countryside Conference had the support of the then Archbishop of Canterbury, Michael Ramsey together with the Catholic Archbishop of Westminster in conjunction with the British Council of Churches who came together with an objective of "examining and commenting ethically on how man uses the natural resources in the environment" (Warmback, 2005, p. 78).

It is now over 50 years since the ecumenical report of 1970 from the Church Assembly Board for Social Responsibility was presented. This report may appear irrelevant given the contemporary mass movements like "Time to Act" (2020) explaining Christian Climate Action, the handbook on extinction rebellion called "This is not a Drill" (2019) whose foreword was made by the former Archbishop of Canterbury Rowan William because there has been an escalation in the environmental crisis ever since 1970. In addition, at the same period, the networks of the Anglican response had almost been globalized. In such an amazing international niche with the aid of the Anglican Communion Environmental Network, other groups such as Green Anglicans found in South Africa have joined the cause of promoting environmental ethics (Ferrante, 2008).

Prince Philip, the Duke of Edinburgh is worthy to be mentioned as we acknowledge his importance at one historical point, in the Anglican proposition on environmental ethics. He became very instrumental as it is evidenced in his work with the Right Reverend Michael Mann "Survival or Extinction: A Christian Attitude to the Environment", published in 1989. It is also fascinating that Professor W.A. Whitehouse the founder of Theology and Religion at Kent University was behind the ecumenical group report (Jamieson, 2008). Furthermore, a congregational minister known as Professor Alec Whitehouse who specializes in science and religion contributed technically to the environmental ethics component of the report.

Environmental thinking continues to be given important value, because of the extended ethical concerns of the report. In this report, the phrases and the language used, clearly tell of what the Anglican Church received as the outcome of environmental morals. This is shown by the opening remarks of the Bishop of Leicester that, "One of the outcomes of the report is the word "Ecology" which as well could be used commonly in the Church spheres than ever before!" This word, amazingly is being realized in its fullness in the activities of the current generation of "A Rocha" established in Portugal in 1983. This group is of international Christians for conservation. It informs the Anglican network of Eco-churches universally. A turning point in the Anglican Church at this moment was realized as a result of this report because, it challenged the thinking of the people on environmental ethics (Warmback, 2005, p. 88).

It is prudent to highlight the Anglican concept of mission in order to clearly understand the evolution of environmental ethics. The Anglican mission is double-sided; it has both evangelicalism and socio-action aspects. One of the socio-action aspects known as the fourth mark of mission spells out that "to strive to safeguard the integrity of creation and sustain and renew the life of the earth (Warmback, 2005, p.78). This mark makes it explicit that the Anglican Church is greatly concerned with environmental ethics as it is reflected in the Anglican concept of mission. From this point of view, the Anglican Church became concerned about the environment and came up with a significant aspect of the Anglican concept of mission. Within this context, the Anglican Church got involved in environmental concerns during a convention of 1964 as consideration was made to the assessment of the cropping circumstance of the environmental challenges (Ron, 1981, p. 14). The result of the convention was a report with the title "Man in his living environment". However, as stated by Ron (1981) it was disappointing because the report almost lacked theological input and analysis. It can be noted that many conferences and consultations have been convened since giving more detailed attention to the environment (King, 1977). The outstanding conference in so far as the environment was concerned, was the Lambeth Conference of 1988.

#### 4.2.1 The Lambeth Conference Resolution on the Environment

The Lambeth Conference is a global Anglican conference that converges every decade. It is the topmost body of the Anglican Communion that discusses any internal issues, relations with other churches and religions, and theological, social, and global concerns. Anglican Bishops who attend this conference discuss matters of Anglican unity and identity. The committees prepare a series of resolutions and reports from each of the Lambeth conferences held. The decisions made by the Lambeth Conferences are not binding to over the 38 national Anglican churches. However, they can be adopted by synods of the respective churches and through other constitutional ways to give leeway.

Way back, an ample amount of resolutions had been endorsed by the Lambeth Conference. Cases of pollution were fronted by the Lambeth conference of 1968. In 1978, the Lambeth Conference beseeched the leaders and governments of the universe recollecting emphatically that the chapter was sprinting short, for that matter they should be undertaking expeditiously the issues relating to the environment (Warmback, 2005, p.81). The 1988 Lambeth Conference resolved that bishops from their respective

Provinces and Dioceses inform the Christians of what is occurring in the environment and inspire them to adhere to stewardship of God's world and also take the responsibility of Christian discipleship to their neighbors in taking care of the earth (Coleman, 1992).

The account of the Anglican engagement in environmental concerns became outstanding in the Lambeth Conference of 1998. In this Conference, environmental issues were emphatically expressed with profound concern. It solemnly and exclusively devoted a tie of the resolution entitled "Called to Humanity" (Coleman, 1992, p. 57). This tie transacted with the universal environmental problems and pinpointed the environment as one of the fundamental issues concerning us now. It ought to be pronounced that the Lambeth Conference took this as a moral issue, rather than anything else. In this view of the moral concern, it was incumbent on the Lambeth Conference of 1998 to direct its mind on the biblical perspective of the creation by appealing for a responsible relationship between humans and other creations. The appeal is based on the robust awareness in different parts of the universe that environmental issues are some of the most vital ethical concerns facing us in this century.

There was a realization in the Lambeth Conference that to maintain the God-given gifts in this universe, humans are supposed to have a change in their mindset and behavior. The Conference emphatically suggested behavioral change as the only appropriate alternative remedy for environmental sustainability. This is in respect to the reality that a conjunction of factors, which nonetheless are not limited to, unregulated development, over-consumption, species annihilation, fossil fuel and mineral exhaustion, motor vehicle and industrial pollution, soil erosion, over-population, and deforestation have destructive universal effects on the environment (Warmback, 2005). The Conference highlighted that the viable confirmation of global warming combined with the expanding desertification, rising of waterbodies' levels, and disintegration of the freezing regions are indicators and alarms that must be taken earnestly by humans before it gets too late. It was observed by the Conference that the poor are more affected by the degradation of the environment, meanwhile, young people and the future generation will inherit the outcomes of the degradation of the environment, thus concluding that environmental concerns are intimately inseparable from concerns of justice (Coleman, 1992, p. 57).

The following observations were made and re-stated by the Lambeth Conference from resolutions 1.8 and 1.9 concerning creation, ecology, and environment:

- 1) The biblical perspective of creation acknowledges the interdependence and the relations that exist among creations, conjoined with God through the covenant He established with the entire world and all creatures.
- 2) There is a point-blank induction of genocide on millions of peoples as a result of the destruction of the natural ecosystem and leading to the degeneration of millions of plants and animal species. Unchecked capitalism, egocentrism, and gluttony should be stopped to overcome the pollution, exploitation, and destruction of the balance of the natural habitats;



3) We should fulfill our responsibility of working as stewards of God's creation and we should collaborate with others from different backgrounds in fulfillment of this responsibility (Lambeth Conference, 1998)

The Anglican Church after the 1998 Lambeth Conference, ceaselessly articulated its anxiety to handle with a louder voice and visibility throughout the Anglican Communion such environmental issues as raised above. In this perspective for somebody to confirm whether the Anglican Church has upheld the above-mentioned articulation, we contemplate the initiatives in place that enable the implementation of the expressions intended to handle environmental issues by the Communion.

#### 4.2.2 The Global Anglican Congress and Stewardship of Creation

The first official Global Anglican Congress on the Stewardship of Creation was held in South Africa outside Pretoria in a place known as Good Shepherd Retreat Centre (Warmback, 2005, p. 82). This occurred before the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) of 2002 which took place in Johannesburg South Africa. The Anglicans convened in this first official international conference to deliberate on issues concerning the environment (Warmback, 2005). Representatives came from all provinces that make up the Anglican Communion. The considerations generally centered on development and poverty extermination (Global Anglican Congress, 2004). Two crucial statements resulted from the Congress. Of the two statements, one was presented by the Anglican Observers at the World Summit on Sustainable Development. The statement submitted to the World Summit on Sustainable Development distinguished the environmental issues as moral at the same time as scientific issues. The Anglican Observers advocated for sustainable usage of the earth's resources for the interest of the entire creation. The second statement was formatted in a pastoral letter to the entire Anglican Communion (Global Anglican Congress, 2004). The ideas expressed in the two statements connoted a strong dedication to caring for the earth and what is therein. The deliberations from the Conference were reported back to the authorities of the Anglican Communion for further reference (Warmback, 2005, p. 84).

#### 4.2.3 The Anglican Consultative Council (ACC)

In September 2002 in Hong Kong, a meeting was convened following the Global Anglican Congress on Stewardship of Creation and World Summit on Sustainable Development. Two resolutions were endorsed by this meeting advocating for environmental concerns (Warmback, 2005, p. 84). These resolutions were in support of what was deliberated upon in the World Summit on Sustainable Development. The Anglican Consultative Council in reflection of what transpired in the latest World Summit convened in Johannesburg, South Africa agreed to advocate for actions in the five basic areas presented by the Summit, such as ecosystem management, water and sanitation, health, energy, agricultural productivity, and biodiversity. The council resolved to:

a) amplify the voice of concern and advocacy calling for a restored and devoted universal approach to the control of any processes that accelerate global warming and upset climate change;

b) Encourage every member of the Anglican Communion to observe the World Environment Day on a Sunday next to the 5<sup>th</sup> of June dedicated as Environment Sunday on which awareness of the environmental concerns could be made throughout the Communion.

The following are the resolutions extracted from the UN Observer and Environmental Network which were adopted by the Anglican Consultative Council:

- 1) Encourage all churches belonging to the Anglican Communion to prioritize environment care on their schedules;
- 2) Encourage all members of the Anglican Communion to commit themselves to caring for God's creations, as they respect all life and affirm that the "Earth belongs to the Lord and all that is in it" Psalm 24:1
- 3) Set up the Anglican Environmental Network as an official network of the Anglican Communion
- 4) Adopt straight fast action, the declarations of the Anglican Congress to the United Nations and the Anglican Communion.

#### 4.2.4 Anglican Communion Environmental Network

The Anglican Communion has called for a number of networks. The Anglican Consultative Council is responsible for the coordination of these networks. The following networks are in operation: Environmental Network, Youth Network, Peace and Justice Network, Family Network, Urban Network, and Refugee Network (Warmback, 2005, p. 86). The Environmental Network is an endeavor by the Communion to practically involve in the environmental concerns. The inspiration of this network was to put in consideration the environmental issue on the schedule of items of the Anglican Church.

The network aimed at the following:

- 1) Encouraging Anglicans to advocate for sustainable environmental practices individually and as groups.
- 2) Disseminating messages about policies endorsed by synods, councils and commissions particularly by the fountain of unity such as the accounts by the Archbishop of Canterbury, declarations like in reports and resolutions by the Lambeth Conference and the Anglican Consultative Council.
- 3) To give a hand to local inventiveness by furnishing messages that bring out the best practices initiated by the Communion.
- 4) To partake messages about what can be used and initiatives that appear to be relevant to Anglicans throughout.
- 5) To render a chance for the Anglicans who exhibit interest to convene formally and informally for a common cause (Anglican Communion, 2007).

#### 4.3 Executive Proclamation on the Environment from Canterbury

With the aim of bring this section on the evolution of environmental ethics by the Anglican Church, herein I provide the executive proclamations from the top most leadership of the Anglican Communion, whose leadership came during the time of the initiatives for environmental ethics.

#### 4.3.1 George Carey 1991-2002

George Carey was the Archbishop of Canterbury between 1991-2003. For the duration he led the Church, he made a point of embracing the arduous assignment of acknowledging the need for creatively handle the environmental challenges humanity is battling with. He responded by inaugurating a church seminal concerning environmental issues on the eve of World Environmental Day that occurred on 4<sup>th</sup> June, 2001. In his address at the launch of the seminar, he appealed for the attention to be focused on the environment. To put clear his point on the environment, two crucial proclamations were made as herein:

Our energy burning lifestyles are pushing our planet to the point of no return. It is dawning on us at last that the life of our world is as vulnerable as the children we raise (Carey, 2001).

Vividly, environmental degradation leads to poverty. An apparent example is the connection between climatic change and extension of deserts, namely the Sahara with the translating loss of both arable and grazing land for herds. Conversely poverty can be the root of environmental damage... Poor people are forced to create conditions that imperil themselves and our world. It is hence very much the interest of richer countries to bring poorer nations out of extreme poverty to share in the fight against environmental change (Carey, 2001).

The above proclamations indicate that Archbishop Carey had a concern about the environmental ethics to such an extent that the issue of environmental justice developed heartily from his presentations.

#### 4.3.2 Rowan Williams 2002 to 2012

Rowan Williams was the Archbishop of Canterbury from 2002 to 2012. In his primacy, he made significant and remarkable points concerning environmental issues. He presented various lectures on the environmental crisis specifically on climate change in our era. It was from the point of view of environmental justice that Archbishop Williams used to argue. He emphatically noted that the ecological issues were a fundamental concern of justice for both humanity and other creations that occupy the earth. He opined that taking creation to be gifts given by God permits humanity to refute the notion that the earth and all what is in are merely there for human consumption only. He continued to submit that:

In case of Christians the linkage there between ecology and justice is fundamental. It is not surprising to note that in our current time the writers on ecology bring it out that the irresponsible handling of the environment doubly mirrors and encourages burdensome politics. To recruit the resources of the natural world into contest for power between humans is passed down; nonetheless the latest decades have made it clear that this process has currently attained a landmark at which the scandal in contrast to nature is no longer a mere issue of moral and theological judgement; is at the extent where the insulted natural order, can no longer cooperate with undisciplined human will (Williams, 2004).

Some of the church practices were applauded for endeavoring to foster environmentally cordial living among individual churches by Archbishop Williams. Nevertheless, he criticized the sluggish rate at which the practices are adopted at the institutional levels of the universal Anglican communion. At the institutional levels where there was non-commitment of salvaging the environment, the Archbishop was too much saddened. He had this to say in his remarks:

The newest development is the outcome of 'Eco-congregations' in which local churches and church groups sign up to a set of environmentally responsible policies for their guidance as individuals and communities. However, there exists still a gap in words and action at the institutional levels as whole (Warmback, 2004, p. 80).

It can be viewed that the archbishop is concerned with the environment issues and in all his endeavors, he was looking forward to a Church that embraces environmental ethics.

#### *4.4 The Evolution of Environmental Ethics in the Anglican Church of Uganda*

In case of the Anglican Church of Uganda, in a meeting which was converged in 1994 at Lweza Conference Centre, Bishops were addressed about the issues of the Church and environmental conservation (Kanyike, 2003, p. 12). They were called upon to be environmental activists. Prior to this address, it had been stated that the most ecologically and environmentally corrupt, ignorant and bankrupt Ugandans were the Christians of Church of Uganda. By then, it was stated that predominately the Anglican Christians of Uganda were in key positions of government, Parliament, Judiciary and other public and private institutions. It had been observed that Christians by then predominately led in the destruction of the environment and this included humanity, forests, lakes, rivers, wildlife, and natural resources. It was further mentioned that Christians had been disconnected from environmentally and ecologically conscious cultures by colonialism and colonial education. Bishops and Christians they led in the Anglican Church of Uganda were called upon to get involved in environmental conservation and protection.

The Anglican Church of Uganda since then started prioritizing the following in the view of environmental ethics: the value of Christian faith in environmental promotion and protection where Spiritual leadership embraces environmental promotion and protection leadership. It was also envisaged that clergy and the Christians were stated to have critical role to play as far as environmental promotion and protection were concerned, since the believers' spirits are only tranquil in a tranquil environment. It was also argued that the only development with value is environmental development. Other forms of development such as spiritual development should be pursued as part of environmental development and they ought to be at equilibrium with each other (Palmer, 2012).

In the Conference at Lweza (Kanyike, 2003), it was resolved that the tool and means of development is the environment, thus it must not be exploited to quench our needs and ends in life. In this regard, the Anglican Church of Uganda was informed that it must be at the centre of coming up with the required ethics and morality for environmental conservation. If this was to be done, the Church was to be at the forefront of environmental renewal. Well knowing the wickedness that was bringing in the problem of environmental decay, collapse and climate changes, the Anglican Church of Uganda was tasked to initiate environmental promotion and protection programmes like tree planting, picking and recycling the plastic materials and sensitizing her people on the dangers of environmental destruction as a strategy to advocate for environmental ethics.

## 5. Conclusion

This study has deliberated to inform us about the broad evolution of environmental ethics. Many philosophers have been seen contributing from their view points to the environmental ethics. We have considered also studying the evolution of environmental ethics from theological perspective in which the theologians and ethicists have been led to look for another perspective from the scriptures and theology which can enable the ecological sustainability and environmental ethics in the natural world which experiences rapid destruction and dilapidation.

From this study, we have seen how the Anglican Church has engaged itself at various levels in environmental ethics. As a body that is universal and connected with an identity that is shared and goes beyond national borders, this Church has a unique perspective on climate change. In this section, we have shown the engagement of the Lambeth Conference and the resolutions made concerning the environment. We have also seen the involvement of the Global Anglican Congress and its mandate in the stewardship of creation. Two crucial statements from Congress made a tremendous contribution to environmental ethics. We have also looked at the Anglican Consultative Council and two resolutions that were endorsed by this meeting advocating for environmental concerns. The Anglican Communion Environmental Network has been reviewed and we have seen that the Environmental Network is an endeavor by the Communion to be practically involved in environmental concerns. We have viewed the key statements from some of the top Anglican Communion leadership on the environment. Finally, we saw a meeting held in 1994 at Lweza Conference Centre, which challenged the Bishops and inspired them to rethink environmental ethics.

## References

- Barker, H., & Bearce, J. (2013). *Religion and Environment*. Zed Books.
- Bauckham, R. (2002). Joining Creation's Praise God. *Eco theology*, 7(1), 45-59.  
<https://doi.org/10.1558/ecotheology.v7i1.45>
- Benson, J. (2001). *Environmental Ethics: An Introduction with Readings*. London: Routledge.
- Bookchin, M., & Foreman, D. (1991). *Defending the Earth*. New York: Black Rose Books.
- Bookchin, M. (1982). *The Ecology of Freedom: The Emergence and Dissolution of Hierarchy*. the Palo Alto, CA: Cheshire Books.
- Bookchin, M. (2001). What is Social Ecology? In B. Michael (Ed.), *Environmental* (5th ed.). Boston: Wadsworth.
- Boylan, M. (2001). *Environmental Ethics*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall. Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Brennan, A., & Yeuk-Sze, L. (2008). Environmental ethics. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Univ.
- Carey, G. (2001). *Opening address, Environmental Seminar, Bishops' Meeting* (4 June 2001). Retrieved September 24, 2019 from [www.archbishopofcanterbury](http://www.archbishopofcanterbury)

- DesJardins, J. R. (2013). *Environmental Ethics: An Introduction to Environmental Ethics*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Eckersley, R. (1992). *Environmentalism and Political Theory: Toward an Eco-Centric Approach*. London: UCL Press.
- Ferrante, J. (2008). *Sociology: A Global Perspective* (7th ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Gewirth, A. (2001). Human Rights and Future Generations. In M. Boylan (Ed.), *Environmental Ethics*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Giorgi, A. (2012). The Descriptive Phenomenological Psychology Method. *Journal of Phenomenological Psychology*, 43(1), 3-12. <https://doi.org/10.1163/156916212X632934>
- Gnanakan, K. (2004). *God's World: A theology of the Environment*. London: SPCK.
- Jamieson, D. (2008). *Ethics and the Environment: An Introduction*. Cambridge, UK. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511806186>
- Jamieson, S. (2004). Likert Scales: How to use them? *Medical Education*, 38(12), 1217-1218. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2929.2004.02012.x>
- Jenkins, W. (2008). *Ecologies of Grace: Environmental Ethics and Christian Theology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195328516.001.0001>
- Kanyike, E. (2003). *The Principle of Participation in African Cosmology and Anthropology*. Balaka, Malawi: Montfort Media.
- Lambeth Conference. (1998). *Resolutions and Statements on the Environment and Climate Change*. Statements-on-the-environment-and-climate-change.
- Lambeth Conference. (2008). *Resolutions and Statements on the Environment and Climate Change*. Retrieved from <https://anglicanalliance.org/lambeth-conference-resolutions-and-statements-on-the-environment-and-climate-change>.
- Lambeth Conference. (1998). *Transformation and Renewal*, July 18-August 9, 1998. Lambeth Palace; Canterbury. (n.d.). England: Morehouse Publishing.
- Leopold, A. (1949). *Ecology, Environmentalism*. Oxford University Press: Oxford.
- Mies, M., & Shiva, V. (1993). *Ecofeminism*. London: Zed Books. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781350219786>
- Palmer, M. (2012). "Religion & Sustainability" Interview by Mischa Altmann. AnikoBunta, and Olivier Mazimpaka.
- Plumwood, Val. (1991). Nature, Self, and Gender: Feminism, Environmental Philosophy, and the Critique of Rationalism. *Hypatia*, 6(1), 3-27. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1527-2001.1991.tb00206.x>
- Pojman, P., & Louis, P. P. (2012). *Environmental Ethics: Readings in Theory and Applications* (6th ed.). Boston: Wadsworth.
- Robert, M. (2011). *Dr. Karl-Henrik Robèrt- How Can We Tackle the Breakdown in Society?* Retrieved January 15, 2012, from <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GSK4t1gyS9g>

- Spencer, N., & White, R. (2007). *Christianity, Climate Change and Sustainable Living*. London: SPCK.
- Warmback, A. (2005). *Constructing an Oikotheology: The Environment, Poverty and Church in South Africa*.
- Warren, D. M. (1992). *Indigenous Knowledge, Biodiversity, Conservation and Development*. International Conference on Conservation of Biodiversity in Africa: Local Initiatives and Institutional Roles. Nairobi: Kenya.