

# Can “Ecological Empathy” Play an Effective Role to Make an Environmentally Responsible Individual? A Review of Deep Ecology and Covey’s Idea of Empathy

Lecturer Rudmila MAHBUB  
Faculty, School of General Education  
BRAC University  
Dhaka, Bangladesh  
rudmila@bracu.ac.bd

## Abstract

*Nowadays, the environmental crisis is becoming a vital issue to discuss. Our anthropocentric attitude towards nature is creating such disaster that it raises questions about our existence in long run. Deep ecology can play a vital role in the sustainable development of environmental crises. By making a connection between Covey’s 7 habits and deep ecology, we can create an ethically responsible global citizen. This article will try to make a connection between different philosophical thoughts (e.g. Buddhist concept of the Four Noble Truth, Avicenna’s holism, Confucian’s view of loyalty and empathy, Kantian sense of perfect and imperfect duty and ethics of care’s particular other) and deep ecology, to show the role of it for making a globally competent value-driven individual and finally demonstrates a relation between deep ecology and Covey’s Seven Habits to make ecologically empathic and effective global citizens for solving the environmental challenges. The article concludes that ecological empathy can make an effective role in the sustainable development of the environment.*

**Keywords:** *anthropocentric and non-anthropocentric behavior, biotic community, deep ecology, ecological empathy, environmental education, holistic approach, identification.*

## Introduction

In the world of globalization environmental crises are increasing day by day. Along with technological development man’s anthropocentric attitude towards nature is creating a threat to the existence of human beings. The recent incident of COVID-19 is a very good example of man’s excessive manipulation of nature. Apart from the global warming, greenhouse effect, increasing sea level, sudden flooding, Tsunamis, wildfire, earthquakes, the recent epidemic of coronavirus are representing man’s careless behavior to the environment. Thus, it is becoming an urge of the situation to control ourselves and shift our paradigm from

anthropocentrism to non-anthropocentrism for living a balanced and harmonious life. Arne Naess, a Norwegian philosopher coined the term “Deep Ecology” where he shows that like humans, nature is also possessing some value, named intrinsic value. Therefore, like every human being nature is also having the right to flourish.

In this paper, I will raise a few deep ecological questions in brief and focus on the relation between different philosophical thoughts (e.g. Buddhism, Confucian loyalty and empathy, Avicenna’s holistic nature, Kantian perfect and imperfect duty, ethics of care’s particular other) and deep ecology. To explain the link with Buddhism, at first I will illustrate the connection between Four Noble Truths and environment and then show that how the deep ecological idea of self realization is closely related with the Buddhist concept of Nirvana. At the end of this paper, I will show that how the combination of Covey’s seven habits and deep ecology can play a critical role to make a value-derived ecological empathic individual for solving the environmental catastrophe.

*The Four Noble Truths and its relation with the environment:*

According to Buddhism, human beings are suffering from birth to death for their endless desire. These desires are the reasons for all of our problems in life. Buddhism is talking about Four Noble Truths. In brief, the first Noble Truth is accepting the fact that there is suffering in this world, the second Noble Truth is about the origin of *Dukkha* which states that we are suffering because of our desire. That means, the second Noble Truth is talking about the reason behind our suffering. The third Noble Truth is illustrating how can we cease this *Dukkha* by detaching ourselves from all types of attachments and the last one is demonstrating how can we get Nirvana through the eightfold path.

In my opinion, because of our anthropocentric attitude that we are practicing towards the environment, we are suffering nowadays. Thus, to get rid of this crisis we need to understand the concept of Four Noble Truths so that we can be awakened from our selfishness. As Loy (2019) writes,

*The Four Noble Truths provide a framework for diagnosing our current situation and formulating appropriate guidelines — because the threats and disasters we face ultimately stem from the human mind, and therefore require profound changes within our minds. (p. 154)*

Moreover, the environmental catastrophes that we are facing today because of our concept of superiority, are not only a matter of materialistic issues but also spiritual and metaphysical. In this regard, Bloom (1972) mentions,

*Can “Ecological Empathy” Play an Effective Role to Make an Environmentally Responsible Individual?*

*...the ecological crisis is more than the mere disposition of materials in the environment. It is, rather, a spiritual issue... For Buddhism man's problem does not lie outside of him, but within him — in his mind, his thought, his values, and their consequent actions. For Buddhism the ethical problem is also a metaphysical issue. (pp. 125-126)*

At this point, I will talk about the Four Noble Truths in detail and show the connection with the environment.

*The first Noble Truth (Dukkah) and the environmental point of view:*

In Buswell's (2004) book, he is talking about the Four Noble Truths and shows that, these Noble Truths are not only representing the suffering of this world but also it is demonstrating the way to get rid of this suffering. The first sermon of the Four Noble Truths of Buddhism is stating,

*This, bhikkhus, is the Noble Truth that is suffering. Birth is suffering; old age is suffering; illness is suffering; death is suffering; sorrow and grief, physical and mental suffering, and disturbance are suffering. Association with things not liked is suffering, separation from desired things is suffering; not getting what one wants is suffering; in short, the five aggregates of grasping are suffering. (Book of Kindred Sayings [Samyutta-nikaya], vol. 5, line 410ff). (p. 296)*

According to the Buddhist concept of suffering, we are suffering from birth to death because we are clinging ourselves to the five SKANDHA (AGGREGATE) which are: form or material image (*rupa*), sensations or feelings (*vedana*), perceptions (*samjna*), mental activity or formations (*sankhara*) and consciousness (*vijnana*). In Buswell's (2004) statement,

*...there were three kinds of suffering: suffering that is inherent in a thing, suffering that emerges because things change, and suffering that develops because something else influences an experience. (p. 296)*

Therefore, everywhere in this world suffering is present because we are attaching ourselves with the impermanent things of this world and inviting sorrow in our life. If we are focusing on our natural environment we will see that the environment is suffering as a whole because of our anthropocentric attitude towards nature. The increasing ratio of greenhouse gas, pollution are creating unexpected disasters in our regular lifestyle. As a result, we all are suffering as a whole. COVID-19 is one of the recent examples of it. This concept of suffering can also be found in Henning's (2002) view,

*Dukkha or the First Noble Truth applies to the natural environment with the recognition that nature is suffering as a whole and that serious environmental crises are appearing locally and globally everywhere. (p. 50)*

*The second Noble Truth (Samudaya) and the environmental point of view:*

The second Noble Truth illustrates that,

*This, bhikkhus, is the Noble Truth that is the arising of suffering. This is craving that leads to rebirth, is connected with pleasure and passion and finds pleasure in this or that; that is, craving for desire, existence, and the fading away of existence. (Book of Kindred Sayings [Samyutta-nikaya], vol. 5, line 410ff). (Buswell, 2004, p. 296)*

This Noble Truth is basically focusing on the reason behind how and why we are suffering. It elucidates that we are suffering because of our endless desire and attachment. Our carving to achieve something along with our “I” centric mentality is also the root cause of our suffering. As we are always trying to satisfy this “I”, we cannot get rid of the desire, as a result, this desire is bringing sorrow in our life. As Henning (2002) writes, “Suffering is often self-inflicted by grasping after the illusions of an «I, me, and mine».” (p. 51)

To explain the connection between the second Noble Truth and environment, everything in this world is followed by the law of cause and effect. Thus, there must be a reason behind the suffering that we are facing because of the environmental calamities. Henning (2002) notes,

*Phra Debvedi considers these fundamental principles: (a) Everything in the universe is subject to the law of cause and effect. Every act of man has an effect on the universe. Thus man is part of the process and subject to the laws of nature, including impermanence and suffering along with other beings;... (Phra Debvedi, 1993). (p. 51)*

Hence, climate and environmental changes that we are facing nowadays are the effect of our abusive practice towards nature. Even if we are depending on nature, we are destroying it. Therefore, our desire and ignorance towards the practices with nature, we are suffering.

*The third Noble Truth (Nirodha) and the environmental point of view:*

This Noble Truth is known as “cessation” and is closely connected with the second one. It says that,

*This, bhikkhus, is the Noble Truth that is the ending of suffering. This is the complete fading away and ending of that very craving, giving it up, renouncing it, releasing it, and letting go. (Book of Kindred Sayings [Samyutta-nikaya], vol. 5, line 410ff). (Buswell, 2004, p. 296)*

This means that, if we are suffering because of our carving then it can be ended by stopping this carving or desire. Henning (2002) comments,

*Can “Ecological Empathy” Play an Effective Role to Make an Environmentally Responsible Individual?*

*Thus the third Noble Truth is the realization that people can transcend Dukkha or mental pain and grief. Just as a flame expires without fuel, Dukkha similarly becomes extinct if its fuel of craving is consumed. (Inwood, 1981). (p. 52)*

From the view of the environment, when we will be able to figure out the reasons behind the environmental problems, we will be able to reduce the environmental challenges that we are facing nowadays. And when we realize the reason behind suffering is due to environmental abuses then, instead of doing the misconduct to nature, we will take adaptations and mitigation measurements. Such as for adaptation we can cop-up some behavioral shifts and for mitigation, we can reduce the emission of carbon dioxide and greenhouse gases (GHG) and enhance the sinks into the atmosphere. Thus, it is essential to have the right understanding and mindfulness to practice and uphold new habits. As Loy (2019) states,

*To survive the rough transitions ahead, our lifestyles and expectations must change. This involves new habits as well as new values... Individually, we must adopt behaviors that increase everyday ecological awareness and reduce our “carbon footprint.” (pp. 154-155)*

It is essential to note that even if people are understanding the aftereffect of misusing nature, if they are not having a mindful desire to take proper action, ultimately this understanding will go to vein. Thus it is important to follow right behavior through right mindfulness and understanding. About this Thathong (2012) notes

*Even when people understand the cause and effect of environmental problems, they will not change their behaviours harmful to the environment if their minds do not have the desire to do so. Thus, panya must be supported and enhanced by sila and samadhi. (Payutto, 1995). (p. 5064)*

*The fourth Noble Truth (Magga) and the environmental point of view:*

The fourth Noble Truth articulates that,

*This, bhikkhus, is the Noble Truth that is the way leading to the ending of suffering. This is the eightfold path of the noble ones: right view, right intention, right speech, right action, right livelihood, right effort, right mindfulness, and right concentration. (Book of Kindred Sayings [Samyutta-nikaya], vol. 5, line 410ff) (Buswell, 2004, p. 296)*

The last Noble Truth is ultimately showing us the way (the eightfold path) to be awakened and enlightened. There are three stages of this eightfold path. The right understanding and right thoughts are under the stage of right wisdom, the next three paths, right speech, right conduct, and right livelihood, can guide us how to do good through the proper ethical conduct and lastly the last three paths,

right effort, right mindfulness, and right concentration belong to the state of right concentration. All of these eight-fold paths are interconnected with each other.

The first group illustrates that one must have the right knowledge to realize their own self and their position to the world. When an individual is having the right understanding and thought that he is only one of the parts of nature like the other species of the environment and causing suffering to one of the parts of it is ultimately suffering himself, he will naturally stop abusing nature. In Henning's (2002) statement, "...wise protection of the natural environment will lessen the suffering for oneself and other beings" (p. 53). Consequently, the right understanding will create the right thought process which will lead towards the right speech. The right speech emanates the right action where the individual will take necessary measurements to protect nature. When we will take the proper initiative to preserve nature, we will create the right livelihood.

At this point, it is essential to note that to live the right livelihood, the right effort is indispensable because our endless carving can overpower us. Thus, to live a good life we need to focus on the right effort simultaneously. This right effort will create the right awareness in our minds. This awareness is avoiding the "monkey mind" condition and helping us to concentrate in the present followed by the right concentration. Eventually, it is leading us to the proper initiative for protecting the environment. As Henning (2002) writes,

*Right awareness encompasses mindfulness of one's own attitude toward nature as well as one's own behavior, in not destroying or degrading the natural environment, as well as by taking measures to protect and enhance it. (p. 55)*

From the above-mentioned discussion, it is clear that the Four Noble Truths can be a better solution to solve the environmental crisis. Because through this process we get to know that, we are suffering as a whole along with the environment, there is reason behind this suffering, together we can cease the cause of this suffering and finally we can get rid from it by following the eightfold path which will lead us to Nirvana. However, this Buddhist concept of Nirvana is closely connected with deep ecology's concept of Self realization. Therefore, in below mentioned paragraph I will talk about the connection between Nirvana and Self-realization, and show the impact of it in terms of solving the environmental crisis.

*Can “Ecological Empathy” Play an Effective Role to Make an Environmentally Responsible Individual?*

*Some fundamental ecological questions: deep ecology and the Four Noble Truths of Buddhism*

The term deep ecology can be considered as a non-anthropocentric approach towards the environment, is rejecting any bifurcation between man and nature and asking more fundamental questions related to the man-nature relationship. According to Talukder (2018) “Deep ecology as an environmental movement emphasizes Self-realization, ecological wisdom, and asking of deeper questions” (p. 11). Devall and Sessions (1985) in their book titled “Deep ecology” mention that, “The essence of deep ecology is to keep asking more searching questions about human life, society, and Nature as in the Western philosophical tradition of Socrates” (p. 65).

If we focus on Socrates’ life we will see that Socrates himself thought that an unexamined life is not worthy. Thus, from the deep ecological point of view, we may ask a few fundamental questions, such as, how and why everything is interconnected? What is the essence of this interconnected relationship? How can we flourish this nature in the man-nature relationship? According to Devall and Sessions (1985), “The foundations of deep ecology are the basic intuitions and experiencing of ourselves and Nature which comprise ecological consciousness” (p. 65).

To understand the concept of ecological consciousness it is essential to understand the concept of Self-realization. The word Self-realization is considered as one of the fundamental concepts of deep ecology. It is considering the whole ecosystem as one community.

Talukder (2018) notes that,

*Naess writes, “the Self in question is a symbol of identification with an absolute maximum range of beings” (quoted in Fox 1990, 99). He also adds, “[t]his large comprehensive Self (with a capital «S») embraces all the life forms on the planet” (Naess 1986, 80). (p. 13)*

He (2018) writes, “The Self can also be seen as an extended manifestation of the self or, in other words, the universal Self is the mature form of the narrow self.” (p. 13) Naess talked about two types of selves, Self with capital “S” and self with small “s”. The former one is representing the universal Self and the latter one is pointing the individual self. In a narrow sense, individuals must try to get rid of their narrower self by diminishing the egoistic desires of an individual and trying to be united with the ultimate Self. In this stage, he will feel a spiritual interconnection between himself and all the entities of the world and consider himself as a part of nature. He understands that doing harm to nature is ultimately

making our existence in question because we all are interrelated with each other. This Self-realization is the spiritual development of an individual that a person can achieve by freeing himself from all kinds of self-concern. As Talukder (2018) writes,

*...two basic principles — the diminishing of ego and the integrity between the human and the non-human world — constitute Naess's ultimate norm of Self-realization. By the diminishing of ego, he means the gradual reduction of our hedonistic attitudes and the curtailment of our Western isolated egos. The integrity principle says that everything in this biosphere is internally connected, as all organisms are parts of an integrated whole. That is, if we harm any elements in nature, then eventually we will harm ourselves. (p. 12)*

This process of self-realization is showing that human beings are not superior to the elements of nature and there is no hierarchy in man and nature relationship. Henning (2002) observes that,

*With the ecological self or true self arising and breaking out of the prison-self of separate ego, moral exhortation becomes more and more irrelevant, particularly under non-self and Deep Ecology. Thus Dhamma or nature helps us to overcome our alienation from the world and its living creatures and changes the way we experience selfhood through an ever-widening process of identification with other living beings and forms of creation. (p. 82)*

Therefore, from the above discussion, it can be stated that in the process of Self-realization all forms of life are considered fundamentally one which has a resemblance with the Buddhist concept of oneness. As Henning (2002) mentions, "Buddhism and Deep Ecology focuses on the Buddhist view of «One» world that is home to all known life." (p. 7) This concept of "Oneness" is also visible in the Buddhist concept of Nirvana. Henning (2002) writes, "This state of oneness is called Nirvana or Enlightenment. The teachings of Buddha also portray a total connection with everything that is also part of Deep Ecology." (p. 2)

Thus, from the above-mentioned statements, we can draw the assumption that to live a balanced and harmonious life at first we must be get rid of our egoistic and anthropocentric attitude (The smaller self) towards nature and move forward to be united with the capital Self through our spiritual awareness. Because that is how we can achieve Oneness or Nirvana. In this process of Self-realization, we understand that neither we are alien nor master to nature. Our relation to nature is a relation of stewardship. We are just the integral part of it and we are interconnected. this realization is helping us to be free from all the suffering of the world. At this level, we understand the notion of selflessness. Talukder (2018) writes,

*Can “Ecological Empathy” Play an Effective Role to Make an Environmentally Responsible Individual?*

*Narrow human dominance dissolves into the Self. So, the Self, in another sense, refers to the wider, broadened, matured, refined, examined, and developed self. (p. 13)*

Thus, it is essential to understand the interrelation between the greater Self and individual self to understand the deepest meaning of deep ecology. And to make an ecologically empathic global citizen, there can be no other alternative but to be consolidated with these ideas.

*Avicenna and the holistic approach:*

Naess considers deep ecology as the holistic approach of environmental ethics. Devall and Sessions (1985) state that, “Some will no doubt say that deep ecology proposals for holistic management and reinhabitation are overly idealistic and impractical on a global scale” (p. 158).

This holistic approach can also be seen in one of the most influential Islamic philosophers Avicenna’s philosophy as well. Avicenna talks about the holistic nature of human beings in his idea of medicine. For him, mind and body are not separated but interrelated. While treating a patient, he gives priority to both psychic and physical life. Whereas in the western tradition, especially in Descartes's philosophy, a clear distinction between mind and body are visible, Avicenna makes non-distinction between them. One of the articles published by UNESCO (2004) points out that, “Since Avicenna considered each human being to be a whole, he did not make a strict distinction between mind and body as is often done today” (p. 23).

This holistic approach of Avicenna can also be connected with the concept of Naess’s holistic approach. Even if Avicenna talks about medicine, this concept can also be considered in terms of the environment. If we consider the environment as a whole then humans and nature are not different from each other but they are an integral part of the environment who has a different role to play for their own sustainability and flourishing. As it is mentioned by the article of UNESCO (2004), “In Avicenna’s science, humankind is (still) looking for a harmonious relationship with nature, and seeking to know it and conform to it” (p. 19).

The article of UNESCO (2004) also stipulates that,

*Treating the person as a whole, however, should not be confined to Avicenna’s holistic approach in medicine. This attitude was manifest throughout his entire life: through his involvement in politics (unity of theory and practice, of science and politics); through his quality as a universal scholar (unity of different parts of*

*knowledge); and through his relationship with nature (unity of humankind and its environment). (pp. 24-25)*

The same reflection can also be seen in the chapter titled “Some Sources of the deep ecology perspective” written by Devall and Sessions (1985). It says that,

*We are now aware that physical health cannot be separated from the mental health, and the health of the individual cannot be separated from the health of the environment. (p. 89)*

An American ecologist, Aldo Leopold, also talked about this sense of integrity in his book *A Sand County Almanac*. According to Satyanarayana (2009):

*In his concept of “Land Ethics”, humans are considered as part and parcel of a wider community, which Leopold called as “biotic community”, an enlarged community, which includes not only all living species but also all members of the ecological system, including water, air, and soil, or collectively-the land. (p. 131)*

The principle of land ethic is also demonstrating the sense of holism. It states that, “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” (p. 131). William Godfrey-Smith (1979), an Australian philosopher, in his essay titled ‘The Value of Wilderness’ asserts that: “The holistic conception of the natural world contains, in my view, the possibility of extending the idea of community beyond human society” (p. 317).

Thus, it is evident that the concept of integrity is fundamental in the process of holism that we can observe in the view of Naess, Avicenna, Leopold, and Godfrey-Smith. We might be the different elements of nature, yet for solving the environmental crisis and for the sustainability and flourishing of the environment as a whole, there can be no alternative than following holism. As Talukder (2019) states, “Deep ecologist Arne Naess also presents a similar view by mixing ecology and ethics as an alternative to solve the environmental crisis... the principle of integrity is the (moral) basis of biocentric holism (pp. 7-8).”

#### *Kantian sense of perfect and imperfect duty and deep ecology:*

Naess’s first principle of deep ecology can be illustrated with the Kantian conception of perfect and imperfect duty. According to the first principle of deep ecology:

*The well-being and flourishing of human and nonhuman Life on Earth have value in themselves (synonyms: intrinsic value, inherent value). These values are independent of the usefulness of the non-human world for human purposes. (Deval & Sessions, 1985, p. 70)*

*Can “Ecological Empathy” Play an Effective Role to Make an Environmentally Responsible Individual?*

This principle refers that, everything within the biotic community is having value, not because of its usefulness but because they are valuable within themselves. We can observe the same perception in Kantian ethics as well. As Godfrey-Smith (1979) articulates while rejecting the Cartesian conception and proposing certain types of behavioral change, “A recognition that biological systems are items which possess intrinsic value, in Kant’s terminology, that they are «ends in themselves»”. (p. 318)

Pojman and Fieser (2009), in their book *Ethics Discovering Right and Wrong*, states that:

*Kant wanted to remove moral truth from the zone of contingency and empirical observation and place it securely in the area of necessary, absolute, universal truth. Morality’s value is not based on the fact that it has instrumental value, that it often secures nonmoral goods such as happiness; rather, morality is valuable in its own right.* (p. 117)

Kant considers categorical imperative (CI) as the supreme principle of morality which is followed by the rational being’s sense of duty. For him, categorical imperative (CI) is, “Act only according to that maxim by which you can at the same time will that it would become a universal law” (Pojman and Fieser, 2009, p. 119).

Pojman and Fieser (2009) illustrates categorical imperative (CI) as such,

*The general scheme of the CI procedure, then, is this:*

*Maxim of action*

↓

*Universalize maxim*

↓

*Accept successfully universalized maxim (reject unsuccessful maxim)* (p. 119)

Now I will explain this with two examples (One for perfect duty and another is for imperfect duty). Let’s consider the first example where human beings are abusing nature even after knowing that they are an integral part of the environment. Now, according to the categorical imperative at first, we need to formulate the maxim. So, the maxim of this given scenario is,

we are one of the integral parts of nature but we are not enriching the richness and the diversity of nature.

Secondly, we need to universalize the maxim. So, we need to think of a world where every individual will follow the same maxim. By being a member of the biotic community, we will not let the community flourish.

Thirdly, we need to check whether there is any contradiction or not. If it is contradicting then the maxim is immoral (perfect duty). If there is no contradiction but we cannot think of a world of that maxim, then the maxim is immoral (Imperfect duty).

By analyzing the given example we can see that there is a clear contradiction. Because if we are one of the members of the biotic community and if we are not let the community develop, we are basically causing harm to ourselves. And as rational beings, we cannot continue this practice because in that case, we are not following the duty of integrity. Thus, it is our perfect duty to value and respect nature rather than abuse it.

For the second scenario, let's consider an example where we are thinking for the sustainability of nature, the policy must be followed and implemented, but we are choosing not to do so.

Now, if we are following the steps of CI, firstly we need to formulate the maxim that is, even though we have the capability to follow the policy for the flourishing of nature, we choose not to do so.

Secondly, we can think of a world where every human being is having the ability to save nature by following the policies but they are choosing not to do that.

Thirdly, if we check with contradiction, definitely there is no contradiction in this given scenario, yet we cannot think of a world where everyone is capable to save nature but no one is taking initiative. Therefore, it is our imperfect duty to follow the policy for the sustainable development and flourishing of nature.

Thus, from the above discussion, it is clear that Kantian ethics will also support our moral obligation towards nature because nature is valuable within itself which Kant named as "end in itself". Even though Kant talks about the "pure reason", that is not against one's inclination but to some extent, it is connected with Naess's concept of identification. As Talukder (2018) mentions,

*Reitan maintains that Naess's "narrow reading" of Kant fails to grasp what moral acts are. According to this reading, acts that are performed by "pure practical reason" without personal feelings, desires, and so forth, are moral acts. But this does not mean that such acts must be "against one's inclinations"; rather it means only an "indifferent" position. He points out that "one of the elements of Kant's philosophy that is overlooked in the narrow reading is the centrality of respect" (Reitan, 1996, 419). He advances: respect obviously involves certain inclinations, such as emotion. So, Kant uses "respect" in the same sense as Naess*

*Can “Ecological Empathy” Play an Effective Role to Make an Environmentally Responsible Individual?*

uses “identification”. Respecting cannot be just a physical act. Rather, as Reitan puts it, a “mental act” or an “act of will”. (pp. 25-26)

*Ethics of Care and Deep Ecology*

Naess considers self-love as one of the pre-conditions in the process of identification which indicates love for others rather than egoistic love. As Talukder (2018) asserts:

*According to Naess, self-love is a pre-condition for identification. He understands self-love not in an egoistic sense, but rather in a deep and wide sense that promotes others’ interest. The being’s interest, therefore, makes a bridge to reach Self-realization from self-love.’* (p. 14)

This concept of love for others can also be found in ethics of care, precisely in the term “*particular others*”. Ethics of care consider care, empathy, mutual cultivation of trust are have some role to play in the field of ethical principles. Chaffee (2016) states that:

*Virginia Held, a contemporary American philosopher who has devoted her work to care ethics, argues that genuine morality does not take rational principles of “duty” as fundamental, as Kant suggests; nor does it require that we impartially promote the interests of everyone alike, as Utilitarians believe. Instead, morality begins with a conception of the self as embedded in a network of relationships with “particular other”.* (pp. 509-510)

Even though the term “*particular others*” is focusing on the concept or values of women, in the wider sense it can also be incorporating the environment as a whole. Like the way Avicenna’s holistic nature is not limited within medicine, the idea of particular others is also not limited within the relation of women in morality. If we consider the term particular others for the environment and the traditional concept of morality for human beings, we will see that the traditional concept of morality is always focusing on the development of human beings, which includes both men and women, but for the flourishing of an individual the particular others, (e.g. in this case environment) is also having an effective role to play. The identification can only be possible when we are considering particular others, trying to make a connection with every entity of nature, and practicing Self-love. As Chafee (2016) says:

*Whereas traditional ethical theories presuppose that a mature moral life involves disconnecting ourselves from the particular others, care entices develops Simone de Beauvoir’s insight that it is only through interacting with others, through connections, that our choice can have meaning and our world can gain moral significance. Indeed, disconnecting from particular others may make us incapable of morality rather than capable of it, if, as Alison Jaggar suggests, “an*

*ineliminable part of morality consists in responding emotionally to particular others. (p. 510)*

Moreover, it is important to follow the concept of self-love through the sense of identification to understand the “*particular others*”. As Chaffee (2016) enunciates:

*Indeed, whether or not we acknowledge it, we are all what Held calls “relational” selves – selves for whom creating and sustaining mutually caring relationships holds the key to genuine maturity, flourishing, and, ultimately, morality. (p. 510)*

Therefore, the environment can be considered as the particular others mentioned in ethics of care because for making the biocentric equality the role of the particular self cannot be ignored.

#### *Confucianism and identification:*

In Naess’s deep ecology identification is considered as one of the vital concepts, that he prescribes as the process of Self-realization. According to Naess, “Our Self is that with which we identify”. In other words, through the process of identification we know the Self. This notion of identification is closely connected with the Confucian notion of “*the rectification of names*”. The aim of Confucian philosophy is to focus on the moral cultivation of human nature through the process of Ren (Men of Humanity) and Li (Propriety). In this process of moral cultivation, Sage is the ultimate stage. To be in the ultimate stage an individual needs to correspond with the name that s/he is upholding. This sense is connected with the concept of “Loyalty” (Zhong) where an individual is loyal towards his role. Liu (2006) states that:

*Loyalty is not a devotion directed specifically toward one’s superior; rather, it is directed toward the role one plays – being loyal means doing one’s best in whatever one does. in this sense, loyalty can be defined as “doing what one is supposed to do” or “being loyal to one’s role.” In other words, a social role is not simply a social assignment; it is also a moral assignment. Being loyal to one’s role means being able to act in accordance with whatever moral obligations come with the social role. Loyalty is thus being loyal to one’s moral obligations and fulfilling the duty that one’s role dictates. (p. 50)*

Thus, when an individual is following his duty properly by maintaining the ritual propriety (Li), he can embrace the narrower and broader sense of Ren (Caring for others and Humanness) and ultimately reach the higher stage, Sage (Sheng). Therefore, it is clear that an individual can reach the highest stage only when he will play his role properly and be identified with nature. As Talukder (2014) mentions,

*Can “Ecological Empathy” Play an Effective Role to Make an Environmentally Responsible Individual?*

*But this devotion is not easily achievable; in fact, Confucius believed that at the age of seventy one could attain it. Here, we can reasonably argue that Confucius suggested a continuous and persistent identification of human self with nature... So, the Confucian solution of good life turns to make a harmonious contact with nature. (pp. 9-10)*

Now if we consider the above-mentioned statement with environmental ethics, we will see that because of our devastating attitude towards nature which is mostly followed by the sense of anthropocentric morality, we are using nature according to our wish. As an integral part of the environment, we are neither practicing the proper conduct of li which is practicing respectful and courteous behavior, nor we can reach the stage of Ren by practicing humanness, and ultimately failed to do our role accordingly as an integral part of the nature.

The great Confucian commentator Mencius observes human nature as innately good but can do evil action through the outside influences. He talks about four types of feelings of humans, e.g. feeling of commiseration, feeling of shame or dislike, feeling of modesty and complacency, and feeling of approval and disapproval, and shows that:

*...goodness is an innate disposition, is the stronger one. Mencius’ example of how any person would feel distress at seeing a child about to fall into a well and spontaneously attempt to save the child captures the essence of this view (Books of Mencius 2A:6. See also 6A:10). That there is a spontaneous desire to do what is good suggests a naturalistic and deterministic account of human goodness. (Lai, 2008, p. 39)*

We can see the same type of feelings in Naess’s deep ecology when he felt compassion and empathy after seeing a flea dying after jumping into acid. This example of identification shows that we are not separated from each other but are closely intertwined. Thus, we need to nurture this quality of ours to develop the goodness within ourselves. As Lai (2008) states that:

*Mencius sought to locate the source of human goodness in tian, a source more fundamental than humanity itself; in that sense we may say that tian is the transcendent basis for human goodness. Yet, in another sense, the relation between tian and human nature is a closely intertwined one, interdependent rather than independent: the person who preserves (the goodness of) his heart–mind, xin, and who cultivates his nature is engaged in one and the same process of serving tian. (p. 38)*

Another great Confucian commentator Xunzi believes that human being is naturally bad but through proper training and education, we can lead a harmonious life. Talukder (2018) notes,

*Xunzi in his writings on Tien or Nature says, "...nature endows human beings with biological, emotional, and personal governance systems that are seriously underdetermined". (Nelville, 2008, p. 18). (p. 10)*

So, to be a part of the sustainable development of the environment we need to live our life by maintaining balance and harmony with nature.

Furthermore, Naess in his deep ecology considers empathy as a medium of identification. As Talukder (2014) mentions:

*Naess writes, "So there must be identification in order for there to be compassion and, among humans, solidarity" (Naess, 1995: 227). But Naess quickly rejected "compassion", "empathy", or "solidarity", as the basic idea. Rather, these are medium of identification according to him. (p. 15)*

In Talukder's (2018) view:

*Naess mentions that human beings cannot help animals, plants, other species, and even landscapes, because we can only identify ourselves with them. Identification is a situation that "elicits intense empathy" (Naess, 1986, 227). (p. 4)*

For him, "Identification means that one is not alienate from others." (p. 5)

The above-mentioned statements can be analyzed in terms of the Christian and the Confucian golden rule. The Christian golden rule (also known as the positive golden rule) states that "Treat others the way you want to be treated". If we are considering human beings as an integral part of the biotic community then according to the Christian golden rule we will treat nature the way we want to be treated. On the other hand, the Confucian golden rule (also known as a negative golden rule or Confucian empathy, Shu) says that "Do not treat others the way you don't want to be treated". This means that as a part of the environment we shouldn't treat nature in a way we don't want to be treated. But the questions raised here are that if we are considering empathy as a medium of identification according to Naess, which of the above-mentioned golden rule or empathy is more suitable to ensure the sustainability of nature? How do we acknowledge that?

*According to Allinson, the positive and the negative Golden Rule are different, and the latter is superior to the former in that (1) it expresses modesty and humility, (2) it does not presume that one necessarily has knowledge of what the good is – what is good for oneself and whether it would be good for other people, and (3) it is less likely to lead to abuse or moral harm to others. (Liu, 2006, p. 53)*

Ivanhoe points out a challenge of the Christian golden rule which he names as "the principle of reversibility". For him:

*it can end up being a disguised way of advocating the adoption of one's personal preferences. For example, "the principle of reversibility would seem to urge a masochist to become a sadist – to adopt the motto: "«hurt others as you would have*

*Can “Ecological Empathy” Play an Effective Role to Make an Environmentally Responsible Individual?*

*others hurt you».” The Confucian Golden rule, on the other hand, does not seem to have this problem. At first appearance, the negative formulation seems to be a better moral principle. But to see a deeper comparison, we need to consider their applications. (Liu, 2006, pp. 53-54)*

Thus, only feeling the way other is feeling can never be a solution to the environmental crisis. Rather we need to adopt different strategies. At this point, I would like to introduce a new term “ecological empathy”. I think the proper application of ecological empathy can play an effective role to resolve environmental challenges. For this reason, now I will talk about Covey’s seven habits of highly effective people and make a connection with the deep ecology to figure out a tentative solution to environmental problems.

*Covey’s Seven Habits and Deep Ecology of Naess*

Covey (2004) talks about seven habits in his book *The Seven Habits of Highly Effective People* where he shows that how can we be effective individuals. In my opinion, for solving the environmental crisis, an ecologically empathic person is becoming an urge of the situation, and the coalescence of seven habits and deep ecology can play an effective role in this regard.

Covey (2004) shows that to be an effective individual, a mind shift is required which he named as a paradigm shift. It is a thought-changing process, a way to change our mindset or perception. In Covey’s (2004) view:

*In the more general sense, it’s the way we “see” the world -- not in terms of our visual sense of sight, but in terms of perceiving, understanding, and interpreting... The term Paradigm Shift was introduced by Thomas Kuhn in his highly influential landmark book, The Structure of Scientific Revolutions. Kuhn shows how almost every significant breakthrough in the field of scientific endeavor is first a break with tradition, with old ways of thinking, with old paradigms. (pp. 23-29)*

From my view, the way we are abusing nature, we also need to have a shift in our behavior so that we can save nature as well as us from environmental destruction. While refusing the Cartesian perception Godfrey-Smith (1979) is also talking about the necessity of a shift in our behavior. In his words:

*In rejecting the Cartesian conception the following related shifts in attitudes can, I think, be discerned.*

*(1) A change from reductive convergent patterns of thought to divergent holistic patterns.*

*(2) A shift from man's conception of himself as the center of the biological world, to one in which he is conceived of as a component in a network of biological*

*relations, a shift comparable to the Copernican discovery that man does not occupy the physical center of the universe. (p. 318)*

That means, for saving our existence it is becoming an emergency to shift our mind from anthropocentrism to non-anthropocentrism, from dictatorship to stewardship, and follow the interconnectivity between man and nature relationships.

By focusing on the power of paradigm shift Covey (2004) asserts:

*But whether they shift us in positive or negative directions, whether they are instantaneous or developmental, Paradigm Shifts move us from one way of seeing the world to another. And those shifts create powerful change. Our paradigms, correct or incorrect, are the sources of our attitudes and behaviors, and ultimately our relationships with others. (p. 30)*

Covey (2004) observes human life in its full form only in the stage of interdependence. In other words, when human beings can live an interactive life through interrelation only then they can become effective. In his statement:

*Interdependence is a far more mature, more advanced concept. If I am physically interdependent, I am self-reliant and capable, but I also realize that you and I working together can accomplish far more than, even at my best, I could accomplish alone. If I am emotionally interdependent, I derive a great sense of worth within myself, but I also recognize the need for love, for giving, and for receiving love from others. If I am intellectually interdependent, I realize that I need the best thinking of other people to join with my own. (p. 51)*

This idea of Covey cannot simply confine within the development of human beings but it can also be included the nature as well. If we are considering human beings as independent members of the biotic community, then for his full flourishing interdependence with nature is indispensable. We can see this perception in Naess's deep ecology as well. According to Talukder (2018):

*Arne Naess's ecosophy T has as its ultimate norm Self-realization, a norm that holds that all entities in Nature are interrelated. (...) Once identified with Nature they can feel the ecological wholeness, the interconnectedness of animals, plants, and even landscapes. A more deepened, rather than alienated view of empathy and compassion for other biological entities, as they also have potentialities, is the goal of such realization. (p. 29)*

Hence, we can easily understand the necessity of interdependence and interrelations between man-nature relationships to solve environmental problems.

In the next part of the discussion, I will relate Covey's seven habits with the basic principles and concepts of deep ecology and try to find out a better solution for ecological calamity.

*Can “Ecological Empathy” Play an Effective Role to Make an Environmentally Responsible Individual?*

*The Seven Habits and Naess’s principle*

Covey in his first habit (Be proactive) talks about two types of circles, the circle of concern and the circle of influence. People who are living in the circle of concern, are always focusing on the issues that are not in their hands or they are concerned about stuff that they cannot control. Rather than taking initiative, they blame the situation. Because of this reactive and self-centered nature, their circle of influence is shrinking, and circled concern is getting bigger. As a result, they cannot focus on their inner potentiality and develop as a whole. As Talukder (2018) mentions:

*We are not aware of the full extent of humanity’s enormous potential. Our self-centered behavior has narrowed our abilities. We misunderstand the notion of living a meaningful life and instead privilege artificial luxury over protecting the environment. (p. 5)*

On the other hand, the proactive person is taking the necessary steps and is involved in the action. They are focusing on the issues that they can do something about. Therefore, to make an effective change in our behavior towards the environment, it is essential to focus on our proactive nature, so that we can take initiative for solving the environmental crisis. In Bill Devall and George Session’s (1985) words:

*This process involves being honest with ourselves and seeking clarity in our intuitions, then acting from clear principles. It results in taking charge of our actions, taking responsibility, practicing self-discipline, and working honestly within our community. (p. 8)*

The 5th basic principle of deep ecology states that “Present human interference with the nonhuman world is excessive, and the situation is rapidly worsening” (Devall & Session, 1985, p. 70). To stop this situation, steps must be taken. Rather than blaming one another for environmental issues, proper initiatives should be implemented. According to Naess:

*The slogan of “non-interference” does not imply that humans should not modify some ecosystems as do other species. Humans have modified the earth and will probably continue to do so. At issue is the nature and extent of such interference. (Devall & Session, 1985, p. 72)*

This statement shows that up to which extend we can use nature, that must be acknowledged. However, Godfrey-Smith (1979) rejects this use of nature in his *The Value of wilderness* and states that:

*By wilderness I understand any reasonably large tract of the Earth, together with its plant and animal communities, which is substantially unmodified by humans and in particular by human technology. (p. 310)*

Yet, we cannot completely deny the necessity of using nature. The important point over here is that, rather than polluting and destroying nature, we need to preserve and extend it. As Naess says:

*The fight to preserve and extend areas of wilderness or near-wilderness should continue and should focus on the general ecological functions of these areas (one such function: large wilderness areas are required in the biosphere to allow for continued evolutionary speciation of animals and plants). (Devall & Sessions, 1985, p. 73)*

And to follow this, we need to be proactive. We need to be influenced by our positive energy. Unfortunately, as we are focusing on our reactive nature and negative energy, we forget how to live a good and meaningful life. Still, these issues can be solved if we focus on our proactive nature and coming up from our self-centered attitude.

The second habit, “Begin with the end in mind” prescribes having a blueprint in our mind before taking any action. If we are considering the 2nd, 3rd, and 6th principles (2. Richness and diversity of life forms contribute to the realization of these values and are also values in themselves. 3. Humans have no right to reduce this richness and diversity except to satisfy *vital* needs. 6. Policies must therefore be changed. These policies affect basic economic, technological, and ideological structures. The resulting state of affairs will be deeply different from the present.)<sup>1</sup> of Naess, we will see that these principles are focusing on the richness and diversity of nature and advice us, not to use nature without the necessity of survival. At this point, if we consider Covey’s second habit we will see that to make environmental policy we must have a blueprint in our mind that, the policy must be implemented in a way that will increase the richness and diversity of nature and decrease the environmental abuses, yet, economic, technological, and ideological development will be continued.

The third habit, “Put First Things First”, is focusing on the time management matrix where an individual must be knowing the priority of action. Covey presents four quadrants of his third habit; they are Quadrant I - Urgent and Important, Quadrant II - Not Urgent but Important, Quadrant III - Urgent but Not Important, and Quadrant IV - Not Urgent and Not Important. For Covey, the second quadrant

---

<sup>1</sup> Among the 8 basic principles of deep ecology, proposed by Arne Nasess, these 3 are the 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> principles which are mentioned by Devall and Sessions in their book *Deep Ecology* in page 70.

*Can “Ecological Empathy” Play an Effective Role to Make an Environmentally Responsible Individual?*

is the heart of effectiveness because by following it we can make sustainable development. According to Covey (2004):

*It deals with things that are not urgent, but are important. It deals with things like building relationships, writing a personal mission statement, long-range planning, exercising, preventive maintenance, preparation -- all those things we know we need to do, but somehow seldom get around to doing, because they aren't urgent.* (p. 154)

Now, if we focus on the seventh principle of Naess we will see that, to live a good life we need to focus on the quality of living instead of the higher standard of living. In Naess's statement:

*The ideological change is mainly that of appreciating life quality (dwelling in situations of inherent value) rather than adhering to an increasingly higher standard of living. There will be a profound awareness of the difference between big and great.* (Devall & Sessions, 1985, p. 70)

To achieve this quality of life, prescribe by Naess, at first we need to have a vision on our mind (According to the second habit) and then we must control our unnecessary use of nature. We need to know to which extent of preservation of nature is needed rather than exploiting it. We have to maintain the matrix of not urgent but important because this matrix is focusing on the balance and discipline life. Though Naess emphasizes policy changing in his sixth principle, the educational syllabus can also be incorporated with this idea. From the beginning of childhood, we can incorporate some “Save environment” based projects from the primary to higher level of education so that people will become ecologically empathic global citizens. Because only area-based environmental protection cannot save the whole world from environmental crises. As Naess says:

*Whereas “self-determination,” “local community,” and “think globally, act locally,” will remain key terms in the ecology of human societies, nevertheless the implementation of deep changes requires increasingly global action- action across borders.* (Devall & Sessions, 1985, p. 73).

These first three habits of Covey (2004) help a person to overcome his/her challenges, fixing vision, and managing the time matrix. Now if we consider these habits from an environmental view we will see that to make a sustainable development for the environment, it is necessary to take initiative, focus on the circle of influence rather than the circle of concern, set the vision of making effective environment-friendly policies and work a-prior hand even if it is not urgent but important. As far as private victory is concerned, we need to realize that this private victory is not a selfish victory. Instead, it is an urge to get the integral

victory. Because alike Naess, Covey is also thinking that for the full flourishing we must be living in the state of interdependence.

The fourth habit, named Win-win, is the principle of interpersonal leadership. It shows that among the six paradigms (Win/Win, Win/Lose, Lose/Win, Lose/Lose, Win, Win/Win or No Deal) of human interaction Win/Win is the best one because it focuses on cooperation rather than competition. In Covey's (2004) words:

*Win-win means that agreements or solutions are mutually beneficial, mutually satisfying. With a win-win solution, all parties feel good about the decision and feel committed to the action plan. Win-win sees life as a cooperative, not a competitive arena. (p. 207)*

If we can incorporate this habit with the concept of the biotic community and practice the win-win paradigm, it would be possible to ensure balance and harmony in the man-nature relationship. Because in that case we will try not to abuse or pollute nature. Instead, we will focus on the preservation of the environment by maintaining its richness and diversity. Because win-win practice teaches us the loss of one part of the environment, is the loss of the whole system. As Satyanarayana (2009) says,

*...if we harm anything in nature then we are harming ourselves. We have to respect all human and non-human members in their won rights as parts of the whole. (p. 133)*

The fifth habit (Seek first to understand then to be understood) is followed by the principle of empathic communication, which states that we must try to put ourselves into other shoes. For Covey (2004), "The essence of empathic listening is not that you agree with someone; it's that you fully, deeply, understand that person, emotionally as well as intellectually" (p. 24).

Thus, we must be able to see the point of view of others before sharing our own thought to live a harmonious life. According to Covey (2004), "Seek first to understand" involves a very deep shift in paradigm... Knowing how to be understood is the other half of Habit 5, and is equally critical in reaching win-win solution (pp. 239 and 255).

Now, if we consider human beings as a part of the biotic community and put ourselves into the place of nature and try to understand our misbehavior towards it, then we will understand why it is becoming an emergency to cultivate ecological consciousness. As Devall and Sessions (1985) state:

*Cultivating ecological consciousness is a process of learning to appreciate silence and solitude and rediscovering how to listen. It is learning how to be more receptive, trusting, holistic in perception, and is grounded in a vision of nonexploitive science and technology. (p. 8)*

*Can “Ecological Empathy” Play an Effective Role to Make an Environmentally Responsible Individual?*

Thus, living and working with nature is not only a demand for human existence but also is our moral obligation to focus on it. Because humans and nature are not separated but interrelated with each other. I think, at this point, we can take Confucian negative empathy into consideration. By being an integral part of the biotic community, to maintain biocentric equality we must not treat nature in a way we don't want to be treated. And to adapt this type of behavioral change, ecological empathy can play a vital role. We need to be empathic not only towards human beings but also towards nature.

The sixth habit (Synergize) is the essence of principle-centered leadership, particularly focusing on the fact that “the whole is greater than the sum of its parts.” (Covey, 2004, pp. 262 & 263) Covey (2004) says, “It catalyzes, unifies, and unleashes the greatest powers within people” (p. 262). Though Covey (2004) focuses on the unity of the people when they are working in a team, this can also be triggered from the view of the biotic community. If we consider the man-nature relationship as teamwork, then it is clear that without having a cooperative relation none of us can develop fully. Moreover, one of the essences of the synergies is valuing the differences. For Covey (2004), “Valuing the differences is the essence of synergy...” (p. 277) By acknowledging this view from the perspective of the biotic community we will see that every element of this community is invaluable within itself. We simply cannot use them as a means to justify our ends because each of them is valuable just the way they are. As stated in the first principle of Naess:

*The well-being and flourishing of human and nonhuman Life on Earth have value in themselves (synonyms: intrinsic value, inherent value). These values are independent of the usefulness of the non-human world for human purposes. (Devall & Sessions, 1985, p. 70)*

Therefore, it is necessary to practice ecological empathy for valuing nature. If we are only empathic towards human beings, we may not develop our sense of empathy for our surroundings. But as an integral part of the biotic community, we have some moral obligations to all the entities of nature. And in this case, the practice of ecological empathy can develop our sense of stewardship. Thus, ecological empathy is needed to serve the entire biotic community because this is one of the ways to make a connection between the human and non-human elements of nature.

From the above-mentioned discussion, it is clear that in the fourth, fifth, and sixth habit Covey (2004) focuses on the public victory which is the paradigm of interdependence, and for him, we can only achieve it when we are becoming

independent. In his words, “Before moving into the area of Public Victory, we should remember that effective interdependence can only be built on a foundation of true independence. Private Victory precedes Public Victory” (p. 185).

This idea can be found in the concept of Naess’s Self-realization. Whereas Naess uses the smaller self as a dimension of ego and the bigger Self or capital Self in the sense of union with the small self, Covey uses the first three habits for developing oneself and the fourth, fifth, and sixth habit for developing the practice of interpersonal relationships. Because only self victory is not enough to be an effective person, we need to focus on our interrelationships. By realizing our core competence and area of improvement we can become developed individuals, where we are not trying to be an egoistic entity of the world. This sense of realization can create a significant role in our interrelationships with the biotic community. As Devall and Sessions (1985) state:

*A fuller discussion of the biocentric norm as it unfolds itself in practice begins with the realization that we, as individual humans, and as communities of humans, have vital needs which go beyond such basics as food, water, and shelter to include love, play, creative expression, intimate relationships with a particular landscape (or Nature taken in its entirety) as well as intimate relationships with other humans, and the vital need for spiritual growth, for becoming a mature human being. (p. 68)*

The seventh habit, Sharpen the saw, is the principle of the balance self-renewal, which basically focuses on the four dimensions to get a balance life. The four dimensions are, physical, mental, social, and spiritual. Covey (2004) considers these four dimensions for making an effective individual, yet, these can also be used to get a balanced and harmonized man-nature relationship. Even though Covey’s physical dimension is focusing on the effectiveness of our physical body through the right exercise and nutrition, we can practice the same thing in the biotic community as well. Our right practice towards nature, proper maintenance of the environment can also develop both of us through this interpersonal relationship. The spiritual dimension which is connected with the sense of value clarification and commitment, and the mental dimension which is emphasizing on visualization and planning, can also be practiced for the sustainability of nature. The long-term goal for making an eco-friendly environment can definitely be made through proper planning and management.

Last but not least, the social dimension which is focusing on service, empathy, synergy and intrinsic security are the fundamentals to ensure biocentric equality. Thus, it is becoming a demand of the situation to practice ecological empathy and become an effective person for bringing vital and necessary changes in the policies and environmental education. As mentioned by Naess in his 8th

*Can “Ecological Empathy” Play an Effective Role to Make an Environmentally Responsible Individual?*

principle, “Those who subscribe to the foregoing points have an obligation directly or indirectly to try to implement the necessary changes.” (Devall and Sessions, 1985, p. 70)

Basically, in the 7th habit, Covey shows the necessity of all the six habits by focusing on the independence and interdependence paradigm. If we consider Naess at this point, we will see that Naess also talks about the importance of two types of self, where the individual is firstly focusing on self-realization by ignoring the selfish quality and secondly trying to be united with the capital Self. It is important to note that the smaller self and capital Self are not different but identical. And the full flourishing is possible when we are followed by a sense of interdependence. Thus, only by combining individuals to nature, effective environmental policies can be made. As Talukder (2018) says:

*The individual self should achieve the universal Self through the diminishing of ego or through the narrow self. In other words, through realizing the maxim “everything is interrelated”. Naess argues that once the individual self attains Self-realization, her behavior “naturally” and “joyfully” follows the norms of environmental ethics. (p. 12)*

Furthermore, Covey (2004) uses habits as a process of becoming an effective person who will be independent and interdependent. Likewise, Naess uses the term “identification” as a process of achieving Self-realization. As Talukder (2014) mentioned

*...Identification is a “process” for Naess. He has taken it as a tool, a method, a way, or a means, to achieve his ultimate norm “Self- realization”. (p. 93)*

### *Conclusion*

Finally, we can see that both Covey and Naess’s ideologies are connected in many ways as both of them are focusing on the necessity of becoming an interdependent entity of the world. They have used different terms and perceptions in terms of their analysis but at the bottom of their discussion, they are emphasizing the effectiveness of interpersonal relationships. And to make this relation sustainable, ecological empathy can play a vital role. Even though I try to show the connection between different philosophical ideas and Covey’s 7 habits with the deep ecological view, further study can be taken on how we can incorporate this ecological empathy in our education sector for making a globally effective citizen.

**References:**

1. *Avicenna and the ethics of science and technology today*. (2004). UNESCO. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000134475>.
2. Bloom, A. (1972). Buddhism, Nature and the Environment. Source: *The Eastern Buddhist*, NEW SERIES, 5(1), (May, 1972), 115-129. Published by: Eastern Buddhist Society. URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/44361321>.
3. Buswell, R. E. Jr. (2004). *Encyclopedia of Buddhism*. USA: Macmillan Reference.
4. Chaffee, J. (2016). *The Philosopher's way thinking critically about professional ideas*. 5<sup>th</sup> edition. New York: Pearson.
5. Covey, R. S. (2004). *The 7 Habits of Highly Effective People*. London: Pocket books.
6. Devall, B., & Sessions, G. (1985). *Deep Ecology*. Salt Lake City: Gibbs M Smith, Inc.
7. Godfrey-Smith, W. (1979). *The Value of Wilderness*. <https://www.rosemonteis.us/sites/default/files/references/godfrey-smith-1979.pdf>.
8. Henning, D. H. (2002). *A Manual for Buddhism and Deep Ecology*. Thailand: The World Buddhist University.
9. Lai, K. L. (2008). *An introduction to Chinese Philosophy*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
10. Liu, J. (2006). *An introduction to Chinese Philosophy from ancient philosophy to Chinese Buddhism*. USA, UK and Australia: Blackwell publishing.
11. Loy, D. R. (2019). *Ecodharma Buddhist Teachings for the Ecological Crisis*. USA: Wisdom.
12. Naess, A. (2008). *The Ecology of Wisdom*. Berkeley: Counterpoint.
13. Pojman, L. P., & Fieser, J. (2017). *Ethics Discovering Right and wrong*. Eighth edition. Boston: Cengage Learning.
14. Satyanarayana, Y.V. (2009). *Ethics: Theory and Practice*. New Delhi: Pearson.
15. Talukder, Md. M. H. (2018). *Nature and Life: Essays on Deep Ecology and Applied Ethics*. Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
16. Talukder, Md. M. H. (2014). Self, Nature, and Cultural Values. *Cultura. International Journal of Philosophy of Culture and Axiology*, vol VII, 81-99.

*Can “Ecological Empathy” Play an Effective Role to Make an Environmentally Responsible Individual?*

17. Talukder, Md. M. H. (2016). On “Self-Realization” – The Ultimate Norm of Arne Naess’s Ecosophy T. SYMPOSIUM: *Theoretical and Applied Inquiries in Philosophy and Social Sciences* 3(2), 219-235.
18. Thathong, K. (2012). A spiritual dimension and environmental education: Buddhism and environmental crisis. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 5063-5068.