

৪১শ বর্ষ : ১ম ও ২য় সংখ্যা
জানুয়ারি-জুন, জুলাই-ডিসেম্বর, ২০২৪

মানবকেন্দ্রিকতাবাদ ও অ-মানবকেন্দ্রিকতাবাদ: সমন্বয়ের সমস্যা

[Anthropocentrism and Non-Anthropocentrism: Problem of Reconciliation]

খন্দকার তোফায়েল আহমেদ, সহকারী অধ্যাপক, দর্শন বিভাগ, ঢাকা বিশ্ববিদ্যালয়

Email : kh.tofayel@gmail.com

Abstract

Environmental philosophy emerged as a distinct branch of philosophy in the twentieth century, primarily concerned with the moral value of entities within nature and the complex relationship between human beings and the natural environment. Since its inception, one of the most enduring debates within this field has revolved around differing perspectives on the moral worth of nature. Philosophers and environmentalists have traditionally been divided into two broad schools of thought: anthropocentrism and non-anthropocentrism. The anthropocentric perspective maintains that moral consideration is exclusive to human beings, whereas the non-anthropocentric viewpoint extends moral significance to all entities in nature. However, within each of these perspectives, there exist various nuanced positions that further complicate the discourse. It is crucial to recognize that disagreement within these schools does not necessarily equate to direct opposition. For instance, some anthropocentric thinkers acknowledge the moral significance of non-human entities but still uphold the idea that human needs should take precedence. They argue that while non-human beings possess some level of moral value, their use for human benefit remains justified. Conversely, within non-anthropocentrism, a range of views can be found—some scholars argue that moral status should be assigned only to sentient beings capable of experiencing suffering, while others advocate for an even broader ethical framework that grants moral consideration to all aspects of nature, including ecosystems and inanimate entities. Given these differences, the fundamental nature of these two perspectives appears to be in direct contradiction. However, this paper aims to explore whether any reconciliation between anthropocentrism and non-anthropocentrism is possible, examining theoretical and philosophical approaches that might bridge the gap between these seemingly opposing ethical paradigms. By engaging with the complexities and intersections of these perspectives, this study aspires to contribute to the broader discourse on environmental ethics and the moral considerations that underpin our relationship with the natural world.