

DEEP ECOLOGY AND JAINISM
A Critical Assessment of Theory and Practice

by

BLAIR TRELINSKI

A Master's essay submitted to the Department of Religious Studies
in conformity with the requirements for
the degree of Master of Arts

Queen's University
Kingston, Ontario, Canada

August, 2010

Copyright © Blair Trelinski, 2010

Abstract

Deep ecology distinguishes itself from alternate environmental philosophies by considering ecological issues in term of their broader context. That is, deep ecology takes the socio-cultural issues surrounding environmental destruction into account when considering their appropriate solutions. This comprehensive methodology is based on an eight-fold philosophy, which includes the principles of theoretical pluralism, interconnectivity, and non-violence towards the natural world. Similar principles are found within the Jain tradition of Northern India, and are known as *anekāntavāda* (non-absolutism), *parasparopagraho jīvānām* (interrelatedness), and *ahimsā* (non-violence). This similarity has lent itself to easy comparisons between deep ecology and Jainism, in which Jainism is depicted as a religious tradition with inherent environmental values based on deep ecology principles. Yet, scholars such as Devall, Sessions, and Warwick have written of this correlation have focused only narrowly on Jain doctrine, and disregarded the nuanced understanding and complex representations of the living tradition of Jainism. They have failed to take into account the lived reality of Jain practices in their immediate social and cultural context, and consequently, their conclusions are based off of a limited understanding of Jainism. A more critical analysis of Jain doctrines and deep ecology principles will portray the schismatic differences between Jainism and deep ecology, and present them as distinctive philosophies. Therefore, an orthodox understanding of Jainism does not reflect the ideals of deep ecology as presented in its environmental activist philosophy.

Acknowledgements

To Mom, she told me years ago that I had to dedicate the first thing I wrote to her. I doubt this was what you had in mind, but I hope this will do.

A special thanks to:

The entire MA class; thank you for being so brilliant and supportive. I spent most of the year feeling as though I lacked something in comparison while you all spent the rest of it convincing me I didn't.

Prof James Miller: for his ever-helpful criticism and unyielding support. Even when the criticism was sometimes more than I could handle it was always exactly what I needed.

To Babs, thanks for reading it over, I appreciate all the helpful electronic hugs and a place to get away when I needed to.

To Eric, if you don't know why, I'm not going to tell you.

A big thank-you to the ISSJS and Prof. Anne Vallely for the possibility to conduct field research and the opportunity to finally see what I have been reading about for the past four years.

And lastly, this is dedicated to my grandfather, who might not understand why, but supports me anyway.

Table of Contents

Abstract	i
Acknowledgement	ii
Table of Contents	iii
Introduction: The Problems of Deep Ecology and Jainism	1
Chapter 1: Pluralistic Absolutism, Egalitarian Hierarchy, and Other Contradictions	4
What Kind of Religion is Ecological?	7
<i>Anekāntavāda</i> and <i>Parasparopagraho Jīvānām</i>	9
Pluralism in Deep Ecology	12
<i>Anekāntavāda</i> as Problematic to Interfaith Dialogue	16
<i>Parasparopagraho Jīvānām</i> and Egalitarian Interconnection in Jainism	18
Chapter 2: Can any Amount of Violence be Non-Violent?	23
Non-Violence and Jainism	24
Deep Ecology and <i>Ahimsā</i> : a Question of a Defunct Definition	27
Jain <i>Ahimsā</i> 's Applicability?	29
Chapter 3: Animal Liberation and a Jain Living World	35
The Value of Animals	36
Living Beings on a Tiered Playing Field	37
Violent <i>Pinjrapoles</i>	39
Conclusion: 'So What?' and Other Considerations	41
If not Deep Ecology, than perhaps Environmentalism?	44
A Neo-Orthodox Reminaginig of Jainism	46
Work Cited	52
Curriculum Vitae	65

Introduction

The Problems of Deep Ecology and Jainism

Ecologically responsible policies are concerned only in part with pollution and resource depletion. There are deeper concerns which touch upon principles of diversity, complexity, autonomy, decentralization, symbiosis, egalitarianism, and classlessness. (Næss 1973: 95)

Arne Næss developed his doctrine of deep ecology in response to increasing ecological degradation and the perceived inability of contemporary ecological movements to develop substantial and viable solutions to the growing environmental problems of his time. A visionary environmental ethicist, Næss argued for an overhaul to what he called shallow ecology: ecological ethics which focused primarily on developed countries and preventing resource depletion for their benefit. He suggested that shallow ecology be replaced with deep ecology, a series of ethics which address the 'deeper' issues around environmental destruction for the benefit and protection of nature itself (Næss 1973: 95). Deep ecology concentrates on the deeper social and cultural issues surrounding environmental destruction, and in doing so, attempts to establish a comprehensive ethic for the prevention of further ecological damage. Later scholars such as Devall (1999), Sessions (1995) and Warwick (2003) championed Næss's philosophy, establishing it as a contemporary and essential environmental ethos in contemporary ecology. Deep ecology's principles focus around the necessity for intercultural and interdisciplinary dialogue between scholars, and accepting the multiple viewpoints and solutions suggested by them. Deep ecology's philosophy towards the natural environment also focuses on the importance of an egalitarian view of the natural world, in which all living beings are

interconnected and valued equally. Lastly, deep ecology borrowed from the Hindu lexicon, and incorporated its non-violent approach to other living beings, known as *ahimsā*.

In his adoption of the doctrine of *ahimsā* into deep ecology, Arne Næss borrowed directly from Mohandas Gandhi's reflections on the Hindu principle of non-violence (Haigh 2006). Although Næss openly acknowledges his dependence on Gandhi (Næss 2005:25), Næss's use of *ahimsā* is devoid of any of its original religious elements, and has been stripped to its essential ethic: "least harm in every situation" (Snyder 1995: 240). This basic idea of non-violence is not only found in Hinduism, but is also a principle ethic within Jainism, although Jains interpret and apply non-violence differently. Ahimsa is so central to the Jain belief system that they champion it as their maxim: *Ahimsā Paramo Dharma!*¹ As one Jain ascetic explained, Ahimsa is not an ethic, but "*the* virtue: all other restraints are simply elaboration of this central one" (Laidlaw 1995: 153-154).

Jainism is considered by scholars to have developed as an offshoot of Vedic Hinduism around the eighth century BCE (Chapple 2003: 52; Badlani 151-152), and is today a minority tradition centralized in Northern India. Although scholarly literature has traditionally engaged with Jainism as an ascetic world renouncing tradition (Cort 2001: 4), it has recently become associated with ecology and environmental ethics due to its application of non-violence towards the natural world (Chapple "Non-violence in the Web of Life" 2002). More specifically, its doctrines of *anekāntavāda* (non-absolutism) and *parasparopagraho jīvānām* (interrelatedness) are compared to deep ecology's similar values of pluralism and an interconnection between all living beings. As Chapple states, "The common concerns between Jainism and environmentalism can be found in a mutual sensitivity towards living things" (Chapple "Non-violence in the Web

¹ Non-Violence is the Paramount Path!

of Life” 2002: xxxiii).

In the following chapters I will be looking at deep ecology’s ideals as applied to Jain doctrine and present a depiction of how Jainism and deep ecology can be connected through them. To do so, I will draw on deep ecologists as well as environmental ethicists and religious studies scholars who have connected Jainism and the environmental movement, and consider their interpretations of Jain doctrine against the representation of *anekantavada* and *parasparopagraho jīvanām*, and *ahimsa* within orthodox Jainism. In doing so I will superimpose Jain philosophy and deep ecology, and suggest that manner in which Jain doctrines are applied to deep ecology’s environmentalist ideals represent only a superficial understanding of this complex religious tradition, and ignore how Jains live, interpret and actively represent their own philosophy. Consequently, any comparison between Jain ideal and deep ecology represent only a myopic understanding of them and, as a result, Jainism and deep ecology cannot be equated.

Chapter 1

Pluralistic Absolutism, Egalitarian Hierarchy, and Other Contradictions

Arne Næss (1973) coined the term, 'deep ecology' in his article, *The Shallow and the Deep, Long-Range Ecology Movement: A Summary*. It was his passion for environmental protection and deep sense of attachment to the natural world that found and informed the growing environmental movement of deep ecology. Næss wrote of his childhood experience with nature in largely spiritual terms, explaining that “[f]rom when I was about four years old until puberty I could stand or sit for hours, days, weeks, in shallow water on the coast, inspecting and marvelling at the overwhelming diversity and richness of life in the sea” (qtd. in Warwick 1992: 69). From the roots of Næss’s attraction to nature, the philosophy of deep ecology that developed became “almost a religion” as Bill Devall and George Sessions explain (1999: 205). Roger Gottlieb describes the concept of deep ecology as infused with a “sense of reverence and sacredness” (Gottlieb 2001: 17), while Fritjof Capra states that “ecology and spirituality are fundamentally connected, because deep ecological awareness, ultimately, is spiritual awareness” (qtd. in Dudley 2005: 21).

Although the view of deep ecology as a ‘religion’ is often made by those without a clear definition of what religion is, deep ecology nonetheless continues to be understood in largely spiritual terms. Its philosophy of reverence for nature and view of the natural world as imbued with inherent value are also compared with the philosophic traditions of different religious groups. Within the deep ecology movement the importance of connecting deep ecology with a spiritual element has developed as a response to the view that objective science is a conspirator in ecological degradation. For instance, Devall (1999: 205) claims that scientific objectivity removes the life value from the natural world, while spiritualism will ensure nature’s

preservation by maintaining the same. Or as Amit Goswami (2000: 165) argues, a reconnection between science and spirituality is necessary for advancements in environmentalism to occur. Therefore, the spiritual element within deep ecology is considered a tool against the sterilizing effects of science.

Yet, deep ecologists continue to debate the nature and place of the spiritual movement within deep ecology itself. Some scholars suggest that 'religion' is an institution appropriate for only an urban context. Religion is removed from the natural world and, as a result, spirituality is the opposite of religion, and the only appropriate alternative within deep ecology (King 1996: 346; Roof 1993: 76). But Bron Taylor (2001: 176) questions the legitimacy of making the distinction between religiosity and spirituality at all, seeing spirituality as the root of religion rather than its antithesis, and therefore both are appropriate within the deep ecology movement. On the other hand, David Barnhill singles out western religious systems, or Judeo-Christian traditions, claiming that they work against the deep ecology movement, while indigenous and 'Asian traditions' are considered to have stronger similarities to deep ecology (Barnhill 2001: 11). Although the relationship between deep ecology and religion is important to the study of deep ecological theory, the discussion is dominated by the conception distinction between religion and spirituality which too often devolves to a split between Christian and 'Eastern traditions'. Most scholars who have written on deep ecology and religion work with academic blinders to the lived reality of the tradition itself; their work treats the tradition being studied as a monolith, with no variation within the tradition, or between the beliefs and interpretations of the adherents. As a result, the comparative work done between the fields of deep ecology, environmental ethics, and religious studies, is doomed as it fails to take into account the lived, historical reality of religious practices in their immediate social and cultural contexts.

In his historical overview of the developing ecological crisis, Lynn White, Jr. (1967) critiqued the Judeo-Christian worldview for its domination of nature and anthropocentric view of the world. As White explains (1967: 32, 33), the Judeo-Christian creation story produces a nature filled with divine symbols rather than inherent value, and touted the, “Christian dogma of man’s transcendence of, and rightful mastery over, the natural world”. While not a deep ecologist, as Devall notes, it was White’s work on an overview of the ecological movement of his time that informed an evolution within deep ecology that grew to reject western, Judeo-Christian traditions as anti-environmentalist (1998: 303). Other scholars prefer to make a direct connection between a specific tradition and deep ecology, such as Christopher Chapple (2003: 53), who conclusively states: “several aspects of the Jaina religion accord well with contemporary ecological theory...[and] with the basic tenets of DEEP ECOLOGY”. Still others, like David Rothenberg (2002: 35), explain that; “Jainism is probably the least known of the world’s religions, and it is also the most inherently ecological”.

What I seek to present in this chapter is a clear outline of what arguments have been made by scholars such as Chapple and Rothenberg to connect Jainism and deep ecology, focusing primarily on *anekāntavāda* (non-absolutism) and *parasparopagraho jīvānām* (interconnectedness). Then, I will show that these arguments are based on a simplistic and incomplete understanding of the doctrines of Jainism, and that, ultimately, any comparison between Jainism and deep ecology that is constructed from these arguments, is flawed and fictitious.

What Kind of Religion is Ecological?

First, it is important to consider the position of religion in general within the ecological debate when discussing the argument used to compare Jainism to deep ecology. As has been

previously mentioned, Næss's spiritual attraction to nature infused deep ecology with a strong veneration for the environment, which catalyzed the development of the principle that religiosity counters the de-valuation of nature through science (Devall 1999: 205). This broad relationship between deep ecology and religion in general gives context to how Jainism and deep ecology are understood to be linked, and the importance of these spiritual elements to deep ecology theory. As Cynthia Branton (2006: 212) argues, the relationship between religion and ecology is essential to the environmental movement, because

[r]ealizing that religious attitudes and values are indispensable in motivating people to create partnerships and to work together to find long-range solutions to pressing environmental problems is critical, especially with respect to the creation of a more sustainable future.

A slightly less developed argument comes from Mary Evelyn Tucker and John A. Grim, founders of the Forum on Religion and Ecology, who state that “the examination of different religious worldviews may be critical in the task of analyzing the roots of the environmental crisis as well as in proposing solutions” (Tucker and Grim 1994: 11). Although their conviction of the importance of the relationship between environmentalism and religion is less well articulated than Cynthia Branton's, they and their foundation support the idea that through inter-disciplinary work between religious studies scholars, leaders in religious movements, and ecologists, solutions can be developed to address the environmental crisis (Forum on Religion and Ecology, 2010). Paul Pedersen (2004: 269) describes the relationship between religion and ecology as the ‘religious environmentalist paradigm’, and claims that religious and cultural values create an “ecological and conservationist vision of nature”. Much like Tucker and Grim, Pedersen claims that the discussion between religion and environmentalism produces active solutions to prevent

environmental degradation. As Branton (2006: 214) suggests, the global community should recognize the contributions offered by religious organizations towards environmental issues. Nalini Nadkarni (2002) outlines the resulting problems when religious opinions and dialogue on environmental issues are not considered. She claims that it is the failure of scientists and non-scientist, as well as different environmental societies to effectively communicate and work together that prevent true environmental change from occurring (Nadkarni 2002: 188). Similarly, Eric Katz (2000: 21) claims that to accomplish the task of deep ecology, “human social institutions, economics, science, politics, education, philosophy, and religion must be reoriented so that they can exist in harmony with the developing processes and life-forms of the natural world”. Næss recognized that “science is not autonomous” explaining that scientific theories cannot exist outside of other philosophical system, but should exist in coordination with them (Harold 2005: x|ji). These scholars have emphasized the need for a connection between the religious and scientific communities in order to encourage social action on environmental issues. Without this discourse, advancements towards ecological solutions are incomplete and fail to motivate true environmental action.

In response to the call for interfaith and interdisciplinary dialogue between religious groups and environmentalists, the Jain religious community has responded by participating in an international declaration on environmental concerns in order to address ecological degradation under the leadership of L. M. Singhvi, a Digambara Jain. Through international interfaith initiatives such as the Jain Declaration on Nature, representing the Jain community, L. M. Singhvi has attempted to present Jainism as an inherently ecological religious movement

The ecological philosophy of Jainism which flows from its spiritual quest has always been central to its ethics, aesthetics, art, literature, economics and politics. It is

represented in all its glory by the twenty-four Jinas or Tirthankaras (Path-finders) of this era whose example and teachings have been its living legacy through the millennia.

(Singhvi 2010: 1)

Yet, their self-representation as an ecological tradition is flawed. The Jain Declaration on Nature presents *anekāntavāda* (non-absolutism) and *parasparopagraho jīvānām* (interconnectedness)² as Jain ecological ideals, but does not explicitly explore a connection between deep ecology and Jainism in particular. These two principles can be related to deep ecology's ideals of pluralism and interconnectivity respectively, but it is only through a limited understanding of Jain doctrines that Jainism and deep ecology are connected. A more in depth analysis of *anekāntavāda* and *parasparopagraho jīvānām* will show that the true nature of these doctrines does not relate to deep ecology's principles of environmental protection, and therefore Jainism and deep ecology do not equate.

Anekāntavāda and Parasparopagraho Jīvānām

The link between Jainism and deep ecology can be found in the twin doctrines of *anekāntavāda* (non-absolutism) and *parasparopagraho jīvānām* (interconnectedness). *Anekāntavāda*³ is a Jain doctrine that accepts the possibility of a multiplicity of view points and perspectives, is translated into English as the doctrine of non-absolutism. *Anekāntavāda* is also translated as the principle of 'many-pointedness', and is attributed to Mahavira, the twenty-fourth Jain tirthankar, or Jina⁴, from approximately 599-527 BCE, although Mahavira himself

² *Anekāntavāda* and *parasparopagraho jīvānām* will be discussed in further detail in the next section.

³ Also translated as *anekānta*, *anekānta-vāda*, or *anekāntvād*.

⁴ Tirthankara is translated as fordmaker, or "one who establishes a ford (across the ocean of existence)", while Jina means conqueror, or victor. Both are titles given to those who have

never used the term (Radhakrishnan 2004: 183-184). *Anekāntavāda* was fully articulated by the later Jain theorists, such as Siddhasena Divakara, who based his work on written records of sayings attributed to Mahavira including the Svetambara Jain's 'Blessed Scriptures' (*Bhagavati Sutra*) and Siddhasena Divakara's work, *Sammattitarka Sutra*, which is accepted by both the Svetambara and Digambara Jain sects (Charitrapargya 2004: 75; Singh 2008: 524). In Mahavira's 'Exposition of Explanations', found in the Svetambara scripture of the *Viyahapannatti* 2:1 (see Deleu 1996: 89), Mahavira teaches the essence of *anekāntavāda* to a convert Hindu Brahman, Skhandaka Katyayana, through an analogy in which the number of living beings in the world is finite or infinite dependent on one's perspective. Within the academic world, Paul Dundas (1992: 198) explains that *anekāntavāda* is a

multifaceted approach which synthesizes and integrates a variety of contradictory view points as opposed to dogmatic insistence on a mode of analysis based on a single perspective only as the soul means of gaining some kind of understanding of the complexity of reality.

That is, *anekāntavāda* allows for multiple perspectives to be accepted in a discussion, and tolerates contradictory viewpoints when considering environmental problems. John Cort (2000: 324) echoes Tobias, and describes *anekāntavāda* as intellectual non-violence and a form of tolerance and relativity. Together, Cort and Tobias set up the comparison between the doctrine of *anekāntavāda* and deep ecology's theoretical pluralism.

The Jain aphorism, *parasparopagraho jīvānām*, outlines the interconnectivity and interdependence of all life forms, and has been translated by Dundas as "mutual support towards all living beings" (Dundas 2002: 110). *Parasparopagraho jīvānām* can be found in the

overcome to the bondage of samsara and taught the Jain path to liberation from the cycle of rebirth to disciples (Babb 1994: 17).

Tattvārtha sūtra (5.21) a fourth or fifth century BCE text that is attributed to Umāsvāti (Craig 1998: 54). Michael Tobias points to the Jain doctrine of interconnectedness as one of the main supports of the contemporary Jain ecological movement, and has become the Jain environmentalist's war cry of '*Parasparopagraho Jīvānām!*', in which all life is bound together in an "ecological interdependence of all living things" (Tobias 2004: xiv). Tobias (1996: 68) elaborates on this Jain principle, explaining that *parasparopagraho jīvānām* is a call for Jain stewardship of the environment. It is not only used as a call to action against environmental degradation, but emphasizes Jain protectionism towards the natural world. As Aidan Rankin explains, *parasparopagraho jīvānām* suggests to Jains that "to survive, and achieve spiritual maturity, we must cooperate with all beings rather than subdue them or destroy them indifferently in the name of 'progress' " (Rankin 2009: 26).

Anekāntavāda and *parasparopagraho jīvānām* will be compared to deep ecology's ideals of pluralism and interdependence, respectively. That is, the doctrine of *anekāntavāda* is associated with deep ecology's emphasis on the possibility of a plurality of solutions to environmental problems, while the Jain aphorism, *parasparopagraho jīvānām*, compares with deep ecology's emphasis on the interconnectivity of living beings. These two Jain tenets are both cited within the tradition as well as by outside academics as examples of Jainism's inherent ecological ethic. Any comparison between deep ecology and Jainism based on *anekantavada* and *parasparopagraho jīvānām* can be based only on a nearsighted view of the terms, and, as a result, an incomplete representation of the relationship between Jainism and the deep ecology movement through *anekantavada* and *parasparopagraho jīvānām* is produced.

Pluralism in Deep Ecology

First, the idea of *anekantavada* and its relationship to deep ecology's moral pluralism will be examined. During the 1980s a change developed within ecological initiatives, where ecological ethics encouraged a more intercultural and interfaith approach towards the issues facing them (Rockefeller & Elder 1992: 10). Most notably, the concern for an interfaith, holistic approach became an essential part of the growing ecological ethic. Deep ecology advocated "the need of a new foundation of beliefs and values, and a new paradigm to guide human activity to bring it into harmony with the life process of earth"(Coates, Gray, and Heatherington 2006: 308). Arriving at a universally accepted singular solution to ecological problems was considered improbable since cultural, economic and geographic differences within and between nations prevented a "unified international response" to the environmental issues from developing (Yearly 1996: 79; Golley 1999: 52, 53). As Næss (2005 Volume 13: 229) notes,

Supporters of the deep ecology movement in the so-called Second, Third, and Fourth worlds have in part widely differing cultural backgrounds from those of the First World. It is quite natural that the different religious, metaphysical, and philosophical trends color the ultimate premises in systematizations from which the ultimate parts of an environmental ethics are derived.

Næss argues that many philosophical approaches are the only logical outcome of the cultural diversity of the global environmental community. Different groups are expected to propose different solutions, all of which should be accepted and used together to form a comprehensive response to environmental problems (Næss 2005 13: 230). Andrew Light connects Næss's pluralism to Andrew Brennan's metatheoretical pluralism, which recognizes the need for several moral approaches to work together towards environmental issues regardless of their divergent

theoretical bases (Light 2000: 131). Therefore deep ecology's pluralism insists on context specific environmental approaches, where multiple and divergent values and theories are respected within environmental solutions. Nick Bingham gives the example of universal bans on whaling which ignore the value of the peoples and cultures in which substance whaling is essential (Bingham, et al. 2003: 208). Such bans are not acceptable under deep ecology's pluralistic ideal because they ignore the cultural diversity of those who would be affected by them.

John Baird Callicott is one of the few environmental ethicists to critique deep ecology's pluralistic approach. In "*The Case Against Moral Pluralism*", Callicott (1990) claims that deep ecology's pluralism is dangerously unrealistic and is impotent to address environmental issues. Callicott argues that deep ecology's pluralism requires theorists to work with a variety of theories individually and independently of each other in order to address individual environmental problems (Callicott 1990: 99, 119). More succinctly, Callicott's pluralism requires one theoretical framework per ecological crisis. He also argues that no solutions to environmental degradation can be achieved through pluralism since this plurality pushes deep ecology into the trap of moral relativism (Edelglass 2006: 9). Those who defend deep ecology's philosophy of pluralism are quick to respond to Callicott's criticism, explaining that Næss's brand of moral pluralism does not lean towards relativism, but simply accepts that a variety of possible environmental solutions are an inevitable byproduct of the diversity of human cultural experiences and responses to ecological problem. Næss studies different paths to environmental solution, but does not try to reduce them or place a hierarchy between them (Light 2000: 138). As a result of this dialogue between Callicott and supporters of pluralism, deep ecology has refined its pluralistic ideal, which requires multiple solutions, obliging the environmental

community to accept that different cultural groups will produce culturally specific responses to ecological degradation. Such groups must work together to develop an acceptable environmental reaction by forging together multiple appropriate theoretical approaches to environmental problems. In the spirit of deep ecology's acceptance of pluralism, groups seeking to address these issues work together to produce possible solutions based on their individual context, and, as a result, interfaith and interdisciplinary dialogue has become common practice in deep ecology in order to address ecological problems.

The Assisi Declaration of 1986 was touted as the first interfaith ecological initiative of its kind, and developed out of a global conference of religious groups in order to address the involvement of religious organizations in environmental issues. Chris Gayford explained that the Assisi Declaration worked to address the issues of "religion and other belief systems" with "cultural concerns [and] those of the environment" (Gayford 1993: 94; see also World Wide Fund for Nature 1986). Organized by the World Wide Fund for Nature, known today as the World Wildlife Fund or more simply as WWF, the Assisi Declaration was marked by the WWF's deep ecological initiatives on preserving the natural environment through interfaith and cross disciplinary dialogue and cooperation. As Maria Luisia Cohen, President of the Assisi Nature Council explained, the Assisi Declaration was, "...pointing the way to the new ecological concern of the '90s: ... deep ecology" (Cohen 1991: 56). In a later publication, the WWF reviewed the importance of its interfaith work through initiatives such as the Assisi Declaration, and explained how deep ecology's "spiritual parallels" with the natural world informed the WWF's ecological ideals of the time (Dudley 2005: 21). The Assisi Declaration was defined by its acceptance of pluralistic viewpoints and multiplicity of approaches to environmental problems between religion and ecology, and its mandate was to present the "interconnectedness

of religious and environmental concerns” (UNEP 2000: 8). Under L. M. Singhvi, the Jain community (2002: 217-224) participated in the Assisi Declaration’s interfaith dialogue with the environmentalist community, and produced the Jain Declaration on Nature.

The Jain Declaration on Nature used the doctrine of non-absolutism (*anekāntavāda*) to support the ecological movement, and emphasized Jainism’s position as inherently ecological and a representation of their commitment to environmental ideals.

The concept of universal interdependence underpins the Jain theory of knowledge, known as *anekantavada* or the doctrine of manifold aspects. *Anekantavada* describes the world as a multifaceted, everchanging reality with an infinity of viewpoints depending on the time, place, nature and state of the one who is the viewer and that which is viewed. [...]

Because it is rooted in the doctrines of *anekantavada* and *syadvada*, Jainism does not look upon the universe from an anthropocentric, ethnocentric or egocentric viewpoint. It takes into account the viewpoints of other species, other communities and nations and other human beings. (Singhvi 2010)

In *This is Jainism*, a Jain pamphlet distributed by the Digambara Jain community, *anekāntavāda* marks Jainism as a tradition where “*religious toleration, fellowship and coexistence, is the essence of Jaina Philosophy*” (Jain “This Is Jainism” 6). As well, a Jain activist organization known as *Preparing for Peace Project* produced a declaration in which *anekāntavāda* is represented as a method in which “Jainism gives its adherents a unique orientation for recognising and respecting differences” (Jain 2004: 6). Another description from within the Jain community explains that *anekāntavāda* is method of establishing peace and solving twenty first century problems, specifically citing the environmental crisis faced today (Oral Interview). The doctrine of *anekāntavāda* allows Jainism to participate in the discussions on ecological dilemmas

similar to deep ecology's pluralistic philosophy. That is, the doctrine of non-absolutism allows the Jain community to accept multiple solutions and approaches to ecological problems, and allows for an ecological dialogue within the Jain tradition. Such a multifaceted approach has instilled within the Jain tradition the philosophy or plural viewpoints in dialogue between faith-based groups and the scientific community. As a result, the usefulness of intercultural and interfaith approaches and multiplicity of viewpoints to environmental problems is represented within Jainism through *anekāntavāda*. By accepting competing and sometimes contradictory viewpoints, Jainism and deep ecology are connected to one another. Such a comparison between Jainism's *anekāntavāda* and deep ecology's pluralism is based on an incomplete understanding of *anekāntavāda*, which believes that alternate viewpoints are universally accepted within the Jain worldview. Yet, this is not the case.

Anekāntavāda as Problematic to Interfaith Dialogue

Anekāntavāda is often regarded as a world view in which only "partial perspectives" of truth can be represented (Muniji 1995: 19), out of which no complete and singular truth can be produced. Using the doctrine of *anekāntavāda* allows a discussion to be argued on a pluralistic level, where multiple viewpoints and proposals are acceptable within a debate. As Næss explains, in deep ecology a pluralistic approach to environmental problems is key, where the multiple foundations on which deep ecology stands necessitate a plurality of approaches to environmental issues (Light 2000: 126, 136). As a result, *anekāntavāda* has been used within the Jain ecological movement to justify its affiliation within environmental circles as a tradition whose ecological leanings have predated the twentieth century ecological movement. Although the interpretation of *anekāntavāda* as a doctrine of multiple viewpoints may be accurate, as

Singhvi and other Jainism scholars suggest, it is also simplistic. To suggest that *anekāntavāda* makes neither a truth claim, nor a proposal for the superiority of Jain thought, ignores the inherent hierarchy of Jain truth within *anekāntavāda*.

According to Matilal (1981: 6) the doctrine of *anekantaveda* is “characterized by toleration, understanding and respect for the views of others” (qtd. in Cort 2000: 328). Yet, according to one contemporary Jain scholar, Dr. Kusum Jain, *anekāntavāda*’s pluralism exists in a hierarchical state: a Jain must consider opposing or contradictory responses and solutions, yet the Jain ideal is still held as the ultimate and correct answer (Oral Interview). *Anekāntavāda* only requires tolerance of differing viewpoints not the acceptance that each viewpoint is equally valuable and viable. When confronted with an ecological solution to deforestation, *anekāntavāda* theory would motivate the following response: “The tree should be protected, and although one may consider the tree’s value to lie in its ability to produce oxygen, or as a carbon sink, the ultimate truth is that the tree is alive, and this is where its value lies” according to Jain ideals (Oral Interview). That is, the Jain doctrine of *anekāntavāda* allows Jains to accept a point of view in which a tree’s value lies in its ability to produce oxygen, yet, the Jain perspective that the tree’s value is in the fact that it is alive is ultimately the correct one, that supersedes all other claims. Although *anekāntavāda* may seem similar to deep ecology’s emphasis on a multiplicity of viewpoints, the understanding within the Jain community is that *anekāntavāda* expects a hierarchy of truth claims, of which Jain truths are the pinnacle. Therefore, when considering the applicability of Jainism and deep ecology, the ideal of pluralism is not comparable between the two since *anekāntavāda* accepts a hierarchy that does not exist within deep ecology. Though *anekāntavāda* may appear to lend itself to a comparison between Jainism and deep ecology, a more complex representation of the Jain doctrine of non-absolutism delineates from the

pluralism of deep ecology theory. Therefore, a complete understanding of *anekāntavāda* within the Jain community does not equate deep ecology and Jainism together.

Parasparopagraho Jīvānām and Egalitarian Interconnection in Jainism

Jainism is not only compared to deep ecology based on *anekāntavāda*, but also through the idea of *parasparopagraho jīvānām* and the construction of an interconnectivity between all living things within the Jain world view. In Jainism, all things can be classified as either *jiva* or *ajiva*, or more clearly, alive or not-alive, depending on whether they possess a soul or not.

According to the Tattvartha Sutra (2.33), there are 8,400,000 different living beings that exist in the Jain universe (Chapple “Purgation and Virtue in Jainism” 2007: 219). This number is constant and fixed, and used to represent the need to protect the finite amount of beings that are in existence (Oral Interview). However, within this living cosmos, not all beings are considered to possess the same value. Jainism has developed a highly complex taxonomy of living things based on the how many of the five senses a being possess, and categorizes them into one of five broad tiers⁵. Beings that have only the first sense, touch, are known as one-sense beings, and include elements (earth, air, water and fire), and plants, while the more complex the organism, the more senses they have (Valley 2002: 33). The highest tier of the Jain hierarchy includes beings with all five senses, and encompasses mammals (including humans), birds, and reptiles. All beings that are alive (*jiva*) possess a soul and are categorized within this taxonomy that protects them from harm within the Jain cosmos. The Jain Acaranga Sutra explains that “all breathing, existing, living, sentient creatures should not be slain nor treated with violence” (Acaranga Sutra 1.4.1 in Chapple “When World Converge” 2002: 283, 284). In other words, the

⁵ The five senses are themselves a hierarchy: touch, taste, smell, sight, and hearing in that order.

Jain “vision of reality...results in a perception of a living cosmos and inspires an ecologically sensitive response on the part of the adherents to the Jain faith” (Chapple 2001: 207). Therefore the Jain attribution of life to all things, including elements, gives it “the potential to become a powerful force in defense of the environment”, not only towards plants and animals, but in protection of water and air from pollution through industrial harm as well (Shah 1998: 31).

This view of a living cosmos within Jainism fits well into deep ecological theory, which considers a religious system that imbues the natural world with life that is valuable and protected versus an inert and lifeless environment to be the religious ecological equivalent of deep ecological theory. As Warwick Fox (2003: 256) explains, the interconnection and interdependence of the natural world is deeply entwined with the theories of deep ecology, suggesting that the spiritual connections within the organic world through *parasparopagraho jīvānām* are necessary spiritual, and for advancements in environmentalism. Or as Freya Mathews (1995: 126) explains, all things are logically interconnected, and “constituted by their relations with other things”. The living cosmos of Jainism, a world of interconnected living beings, is supported by the aphorism; ‘*parasparopagraho jīvānām*, which stresses the interconnectivity between living things within the Jain world view, and is compared to the deep ecology ideal of interconnection and “emphasis on interrelationships” between living beings (Barnhill 2001: 6). Deep ecology’s interconnected relationships between organisms stress an egalitarian connection between all beings, while Jainism accepts that there is a hierarchy within the living world. As a result, deep ecology and Jainism cannot be related through *parasparopagraho jīvānām*.

L. M. Singhvi points to the doctrine of *parasparopagraho jīvānām* in the Jain Declaration on Nature as a call to environmentalism and characterizes Jainism as a modern scientific

ecological movement (Callicott 1994: 57 & Singhvi 2010: 3). Singhvi and appeals to the sayings of Mahavira, who stated that: “One who neglects or disregards the existence of earth, air, fire, water and vegetation disregards his own existence which is entwined with them” (Singhvi 2010). The interconnection of humans with the natural world is emphasized within Jainism, where humans are neither above the natural environment nor outside of it, and since their existence is entwined with the environment, Singhvi uses *parasparopagraho jīvānām* in the Jain Declaration on Nature to encourage environmental activism within the Jain community. Jains today emphasize *parasparopagraho jīvānām* and the Jain interconnected cosmos as an essential part of their view of the natural world, and place within the environmental movement. By stressing *parasparopagraho jīvānām*, Jains attempt to adhere to deep ecology’s ideals of interconnectivity by claiming the same idea: the interconnectivity and interdependence of all living things. Although deep ecology has come to conclude that the interconnectivity between humans and the world around them is essential to their philosophy of environmental protection, it does not include a hierarchy between being as is found in Jainism.

Yet, what motivates the ecological movement within Jain *parasparopagraho jīvānām*? As Vilas Adinath Sangave explains, *parasparopagraho jīvānām* “defines the score of the modern Ecology as it stresses the fundamental principle that all aspects of nature belong together and are bound in physical as well as metaphysical relationship” (Sangave 2001: 123). Yavacharya Sri, a Digambara Jain monk, explains that the doctrine of *parasparopagraho jīvānām* supports an altruistic protection of other living beings, in which a “mutual benefit’ between beings is developed through the knowledge of their interdependence (Singh 2001: 7355). The challenge to *parasparopagraho jīvānām* as an inherent ecological ethic inline with deep ecology comes from its basic construction under the elaborate typology of living beings found within Jainism.

Humans, who are at the top of this ladder, are gifted with all five senses, and therefore they “must act in a responsible manner and must show compassion and forgiveness to all beings” (Gulati 2008: 165). This responsibility to act implies that humans exist in a superior position to other beings, where their place is above all others, and necessitates human protectionism over the natural world. Therefore the Jain cosmology does not consider all being to exist in equality with each other, but in a hierarchy of being in which interconnectivity exists, but as an interconnection within a hierarchy. Deep ecology’s presentation of interconnectivity, on the other hand, does not recognize a hierarchy of human beings over the natural world. Amit Goswami explains that deep ecology requires humans to overthrow the selfish hierarchy of humans over nature, and instead live in non-competition with the natural world (2000: 165). As a result, Jainism’s ideal of interconnectivity does not fully correspond with the theories of deep ecology: *parasparopagraho jīvānām*’s view of interconnectivity provides a hierarchical view of a living cosmos where humans are above, although indebted to, the living environment around them.

From a cache of religious vocabulary, and a deep love of the natural world, Arne Næss’ theory of deep ecology has produced a spiritual element within the environmental movement. Jainism has attached itself to this spiritual stream within deep ecology by superimposing *anekāntavāda* and *parasparopagraho jīvānām* onto the corresponding theories of pluralism and interconnectivity in deep ecology. Although seemingly consistent parallels are often drawn between the religious doctrines of Jainism and deep ecology by both deep ecologists and Jains, they are nonetheless incompatible. *Anekāntavāda* fails to live up to the pluralism deep ecology requires by holding the higher claim to Jain truth over alternate or competing perspectives. Moreover, when considering the interconnectivity of *parasparopagraho jīvānām*, deep ecology

suggests an egalitarian view of all beings within the natural world, while the Jain doctrine of *parasparopagraho jīvānām* considers humans to be the apex of the web of life in which they enjoy a superior position within the Jain hierarchy of living beings. Consequently, *parasparopagraho jīvānām* does not relate to deep ecology's ideal of an interrelation between all living beings. The comparison between Jainism and deep ecology is constructed on a myopic view of Jain ideals, and through a more complete consideration of these two tenets, deep ecology clearly does not equate to Jainism's *anekāntavāda* and *parasparopagraho jīvānām*.

Chapter 2

Can Any Amount of Violence be Non-Violent?

Non-Violence and Deep Ecology

Jainism and deep ecology are most commonly connected through the Jain doctrine of *ahimsā*, or non-violence⁶, and is best articulated through the aphorism “*ahimsā paramo dharmah*”, or ‘non-violence is the paramount path’ (Misra 2009: 169). This statement has become the calling card of Jainism, and the flag behind which Jains have connected themselves to deep ecology. Kokila Shah explains that Jain “non-violence is the principle for ecological harmony par excellence. It may be compared with Deep Ecology” (Shah 2008: 11). Or as Devall (1992: 54) states: “the norm of nonviolence is readily accepted by deep ecologists”. Deep ecologists use *ahimsā* as a doctrine that respects other living creatures, and requires the protection of these creatures from all forms of harm, specifically harm from human environmental destruction. As we have seen, the Jain understanding of what is a living creature extends to any being that has one or more of the five senses (touch, taste, smell, sight, and hearing). Therefore it requires that the principle of non-violence be used towards elements, plants, animals and humans. Yet the use of *ahimsā* in environmental circles, including deep ecology, is problematic since a clear definition of what is alive, and therefore what should be protected, is not provided by the scholars who use it. As well, Jain *ahimsā* is relativistic, where not all living beings deserve equal protection, and violence is acceptable under certain circumstances. While in deep ecology, the idea of *ahimsā* does not come with a disclaimer for acceptable violence against living beings. Scholars who use the Jain doctrine of *ahimsā* to defend Jainism’s environmentalist position have either ignored or overlooked this aspect of the term.

⁶ *Ahimsā* has also been translated as non-interference, non-injury, or non-harm.

These two problems of an incomplete definition of *ahimsā* and an inaccurate representation of the doctrine, challenge deep ecology's use of *ahimsā* in which it is used without consideration for context. Deep ecology uses the term *ahimsā* to define how appropriate human interactions with the environment are necessary in order to protect the environment from harm.

Unfortunately, those who use the term refer to *ahimsā* as a rejection of all injury against living things, yet fail to explain what is 'living' and therefore what aspect of nature must be protected. As a result, a connection between Jain *ahimsā* and deep ecology cannot be made based on this imperfect usage of the term.

Non-Violence and Jainism

In order to explain, a further definition of Jain *ahimsā* is required. *Ahimsā* is "the widest and most intimate love and acceptance of all, with selfless love. In such a philosophy of life all human beings, nay all living beings should be treated as deserving our equal love" (Mohan 204: 3). *Ahimsā* is so central to the Jain tradition that it is considered to be the most important vow taken by all Jains, where "in Jainism, non-injury is a religion and not merely a part of religion" (Shah 2008: 10). Although Jains are traditionally divided along sectarian lines, all Jains adhere to the vow of *ahimsā*, which, to varying degrees, is a part of the vows taken by both ascetic and lay Jains. The main Jain vows are known as the Great Vows (*mahavratas*) and Little Vows (*anuvratas*), which are taken by ascetics and lay Jains respectively. Both sets of vows contain the pledges of nonharm (*ahimsā*) is considered the primary vow of both the *mahavratas* and the *anuvratas*⁷ (Jain 2009: 199). Pārśvanaātha, the twenty-third *tirthankara* from approximately the

⁷ It should be noted that the *Anuvratas* contain eleven additional vows specific to the householder community, of which *ahimsā* is still the primary vow. As well, the lay Jains

eighth century BCE, was the first to preach the Jain principle of non-violence, and built the doctrine of *ahimsā* from earlier works as articulated through his doctrine of Four Fold Strength (*Cāturvyāma-dharma*) found in the Uttaradhyayana-sutra. *Cāturvyāma-dharma* resembles the vows taken by contemporary Jains (as mentioned above) and included vows of *ahimsā* (nonharm), *satya* (speaking the truth), *asteya* (non-theft), and *aparigraha* (non-attachment) (Muniji 1995: 13 & Mehta 2004: 264-265). *Ahimsā* was later articulated by Mahavira, the twenty-fourth *Tirthunkara*, in the Acaraga Sutra where he states: “All breathing, existing, living, sentient creatures should not be slain, nor treated with violence, nor abused, nor tormented, nor driven away. This is the pure, unchangeable, eternal law” (I.4.1). Violence, according to Jain *ahimsā*, is understood as any interference, interaction, inaction, or action towards another living being (Oral Interview). Mahavira also states in the Kritanga Sutra: “Know and understand that [living beings] all desire happiness. By hurting these beings, people do harm to their own souls, and will repeatedly be born as one of them” (Sutrakritanga 1.7 qtd. in Van Voorst. 2003: 117). That is, if a Jain harms another living being they will gain bad karma (*paap*), which ties the soul to the cycle of rebirth (*samsāra*) (Oral Interview). Because the ultimate goal of all Jains is to achieve liberation and escape from *samsāra* (Chapple 2007: 225), a Jain should abstain from all interferences in the natural life cycle of any living being.

Although other religious traditions such as Hinduism and Buddhism also subscribe to *ahimsā*, Jains are considered to have taken the doctrine to its extreme (Muniji 1995: 19). Jain *ahimsā* requires a non-violent approach to all living things and, as a result, Jains have taken special care to adhere to *ahimsā* by developing proactive methods of preventing accidental harm to these one sensed microorganisms (*nigodas*). The most often cited of which is the wearing of a

interpret *brahmacharya* as a vow of chastity while ascetics consider it a vow to abstain from sex (Pruthi 2004: 149).

specially designed mouth covering called a *muhpatti* (Vallely 2002: 10, 260). A *muhpatti* is a folded square of cloth tied around the head to cover the mouth, and is worn predominantly by the ascetic community, but has also been adopted by particularly observant lay Jains. A *muhpatti* protects against unintentional harm towards air beings, microbial beings in the air, as well as preventing the accidental inhalation of small insects (Babb 1996: 56).

Another form of the extreme observation of *ahimsā* within Jainism is the highly restrictive vegetarian diet that Jains follow. Jains not only practice vegetarianism as abstinence from meat, but also avoid all animal products including eggs and honey. Dairy products, on the other hand, are traditionally consumed by Jains with the note that dairy cannot be taken from the cow if it will affect the calf (Oral Interview). There are further restrictions to the Jain diet against consuming root vegetables because they contain multiple souls, and, as a result, involve excessive harm to many one sensed beings versus the consumption of other plant matter which would harm only one being. As a Jain follower explains: “When a man eats a root-crop, he destroys an infinite number of living beings. The bad karma that he earns is such that he suffers in his next life. O! So many living beings are sacrificed when one eats such food” (qtd. in Cort “Singing the Glory” 2002: 724). Through their dietary restrictions and preventative measure against unintentional harm, Jain *ahimsā* is especially linked to the protection of single sensed beings from violence. This emphasis on protecting plants, air, earth, and water has caught the attention of ecologists and encouraged their adoption of *ahimsā* as an ecological term. Although this extreme expression of *ahimsā* may initially endear the term to environmental movements, it also challenges *ahimsā* use in deep ecology when the definition of *ahimsā*, as used by deep ecologists, is considered. That is, deep ecology co-opts the ideal of *ahimsā*’s non-violent ethos, but fails to outline what beings are included under *ahimsā*’s protective umbrella. For Jains,

ahimsā protects all living being, which are not necessarily accepted as ‘alive’ by other groups who use the term. When deep ecology and environmental ethicists use *ahimsā* as protecting all living creatures without defining the term ‘alive’, the labeling of Jain *ahimsā* as ecological is challenged. Such an omission of a full definition of *ahimsā* forces the reader to infer his or her own definition of what is alive, an oversight that seriously undermines the credibility of *ahimsā*’s use in deep ecology, and prevents Jainism and deep ecology from being connected together.

Deep Ecology and *Ahimsā*: a question of a defunct definition

Deep ecology’s use of *ahimsā* began with Arne Næss who pulled the idea of *ahimsā* from Mohandas Gandhi’s work on animal protection activism, and applied it to his developing theory of deep ecology. Næss idealized Gandhi’s advocacy for animal protection, and regarded *ahimsā*, the manner in which Gandhi lived his life without harming other living beings, as a representation of Gandhi’s “belie[f] in the possibility of a satisfactory coexistence [with animals]” (Næss 1995: 23). Although Gandhi is less known for his involvement in ecological initiatives than his peace activism during India’s independence movement, his advocacy for animal rights and environmentalism nonetheless inspired later ecologists to borrow from his non-violent ideal for environmental protection. Gandhi stated: “We cannot have ecological movement designed to prevent violence against Nature, unless the principle of non-violence becomes central to the ethics of human culture” (Khoshoo and Moolakkattu 2009 qtd. in Moolakkattu 2010: 155). In his work on deep ecology, Næss explained that he borrowed heavily from Gandhi’s philosophy for the right to life of all living things (see Næss 2005 Volume 8: 35-44). Næss considered Gandhi’s *ahimsā* to demonstrate the value inherent within all living beings, and related it to deep ecology’s philosophy of biocentric egalitarianism, which holds that the value of

one living being is no higher than any other (Sessions 1995: 59; Weber 1999: 352). As Martin Haigh explains, it is through Næss's admiration of Gandhi that "[d]eep ecology has already absorbed much from its Vaisnava roots" (Haigh 2006: 51), referring to Gandhi's religious affiliation with Vaishnavite Hinduism. Peter Marshall explains that Næss's interest in the philosophy of *ahimsā* is reflected in the deep ecology ideal that humans "should live with minimum impact on other species and on the earth. We should follow the Hindu path of *ahimsā* (nonviolence) and do as little harm as possible" (1996: 415), where no one being has the right to dominate another. For Næss, *ahimsā*'s emphasis on non-violence towards other living beings includes the natural world, and lends religious support through the doctrine of *ahimsā* to deep ecology's ideas of protecting the environment from harm of human environmental destruction. Although Næss openly borrows from a Hindu understanding of *ahimsā*, and therefore gives context to his use of the term, later theorists who have failed to accurately define the context in which they use *ahimsā*, including which tradition they are borrowing from, and what *ahimsā* encompasses.

On the surface level, deep ecology and *ahimsā* are easily related, yet a simple representation of *ahimsā* as non-violence towards living things, as argued by deep ecologists, fails to represent the true meaning of the term in Jainism. Deep ecology's *ahimsā* requires a non-violent approach to living beings, yet ecologists often fail to define what is considered to be 'alive'. Initially this may not appear to be a large oversight by deep ecologists, yet when *ahimsā* is introduced to a variety of cultural context in which the understanding of what is alive, and ultimately, what should be respected under *ahimsā* is not necessarily the same, a clear definition of the term is essential in order to understand its use. Most often the definition of deep ecologists implies that in addition to humans, plants and animals are alive and deserve protection through

ahimsā. O. P. Dwivedi (2003: 43) defines *ahimsā* as: “non-violence (or non-injury) towards animals and human beings alike”, to the exclusion of plants. On the other hand, Gary Snyder (1995: 240) explains that *ahimsā* is a call for the “least possible harm in every situation”, while Peter Marshall (1996: 415) defines *ahimsā* as “to do as little harm as possible”. All of these scholars provide no further explanation of what or who should be protected from harm under the term *ahimsā*, leaving the definition up to the reader to produce. Dwivedi, Snyder, and Marshall are exemplary of the common habit within deep ecology to omit a full definition of *ahimsā*. By not defining what *ahimsā* denotes and effects, deep ecologists who use the term fail to use it appropriately, and therefore, any comparison between deep ecology and Jainism cannot be based on their mutual use of the term. In addition to a failed definition of what is alive, *ahimsā* continues to be problematic for deep ecology due to the ridged absolutes it uses. For Jains, *ahimsā* is a relative term, in which some violence is acceptable based on context, while deep ecology fails to represent this aspect of the doctrine, and those who draw attention between deep ecology and Jainism do not address this discrepancy. For this second reason, deep ecology and Jainism cannot be compared through *ahimsā*.

Jain *Ahimsā*'s Applicability?

The use of *ahimsā* in deep ecology is commonly presented as a universal term in which non-violence towards living beings is the only appropriate interaction, regardless of context. Yet, Jains would not agree with this conception of the term since they have a relativistic understanding of *ahimsā*, where a certain amount of violence is acceptable based on context. Jains accept that some violence is inevitable and necessary, while deep ecologists do not, and, as a result, Jain *ahimsā* and deep ecology's non-violent ethic towards the environment are not

equivalent.

In Tom Regan's quest for the possibility of an environmental ethic, he outlines the essential characteristics that any appropriate ethos must encompass, stating that respect for objects "in nature gives rise to the preservation principle... a principle of non-destruction, non-interference, and non-meddling" (Regan 1981: 31). His 1981 proposal for a renewed environmental principle emphasized the integration of a non-violent ethos towards nature and living things, echoing the Jain ethic of *ahimsā*.

The Gandhian *ahimsā* on which Næss built his principle of non-violence in deep ecology (Næss 1986: 9) was represented as an unchanging law, where a non-violent interaction is the only appropriate reaction to the natural world. Gandhi explains that *ahimsā* is the only way to protect other beings from harm, and describes *ahimsā* stating:

In its negative form, [*ahimsā*] means not injuring any living being whether by body or mind. I may not therefore, hurt the person of any wrong-doer or bear any ill-will to him and so cause him mental suffering. In its positive form, *ahimsā* means the largest love, the greatest charity. If I am a follower of *ahimsā*, I must love my enemy or a stranger to me as I would my wrong doing father or son. This active *ahimsā* necessarily included truth and fearlessness. (Gandhi qtd. in Chakrabarty 2006: 59-60)

Here, Gandhi explains that all living beings deserve life, and that any *himsa* (harm) towards them is unacceptable according to the law of *ahimsā*. Næss based his work on Gandhi's representation of *ahimsā*, where deep ecology considered any harm towards the natural world as a violation of *ahimsā*. As Devall and Sessions explain, if humans harm any part of nature, they are harming themselves (Devall & Sessions 1985: 68). This understanding of *ahimsā* as a strict 'do no harm' doctrine does not compare to the lived understanding of *ahimsā* within Jainism.

The importance of *ahimsā* in the Jain ecological ethic towards nature is emphasized in the Jain Declaration on Nature: “Jain ecological philosophy is virtually synonymous with the principle of *ahimsā* (non-violence) which runs through the Jain tradition like a golden thread” (Singhvi 2010: 1). The relationship between Jainism and the ecological movement have been taken up most extensively in Chapple’s edited work, *Jainism and Ecology: Nonviolence in the Web of Life* (Chapple 2002). In John Cort’s chapter, “Green Jainism? Notes and Queries towards a Possible Jain Environmental Ethic”, he explains that *ahimsā* requires Jains to protect the environment for the future, because in doing so, Jains will prevent violence against future generations from environmental pollutants (Cort “Green Jainism?” 2002: 74). Meanwhile Satish Kumar (2002: 188) explains that the love towards other living beings through *ahimsā* requires a deep sense of reverence and protection towards them. It is this love for the natural world through *ahimsā*, which motives environmental activism. Anne Vallely (2002: 193) dedicates her chapter to the discrepancies between Indian and diaspora Jain approaches to *ahimsā* and ecology based on “changes and practices of what constitutes Jainism in North America” due to “geographical and cultural distance from India”. She explains that following Jainism involves a negotiation with these geographic and cultural differences, including negotiating what is acceptable violence based on context, more specifically; she cited the negotiation of acceptable violence within Jain dietary restrictions (Vallely 2002: 204). As a result of these different contexts, Jains must change how they approach non-violence in the diaspora. Although deep ecologists have painted *ahimsā* as a universalistic rejection of harm towards all living beings, as Vallely exposes, the lived reality of Jain *ahimsā* is a relativistic one. An example of Jain relativism in *ahimsā* is seen in the acceptability of violence towards lower-sensed creatures (Zaehner 1998: 259).

Ideally, Jain *ahimsā* requires a complete abstention from causing harm to any living

being, where the model is life as a Jain ascetic. Yet in order to live in the lay community, exceptions are made to *ahimsā* to accommodate for inescapable violence, where limited violence is considered inevitable, and therefore, acceptable in order to survive. As has previously been mentioned, Jains maintain a strict vegetarian diet in which honey, eggs, and root vegetables are not consumed. Jains justify these restrictions by appealing to their hierarchy of being. The violence of harming a plant is considered an acceptable amount of violence versus harming a five-sensed animal. An animal is higher in the Jain taxonomy scale, possessing all five of the senses, and a Jain receives more negative karma (*paap*) from harming a five senses being than from harming a plant (Cort “Singing the Glory” 2002: 724). As a result, Jains justify their consumption of plants as an acceptable alternative. A second example of Jain relativism through *ahimsā* looks at the context in which acceptable violent actions change based on the necessity of the action.

The majority of insects have two or three senses: touch, taste, and sometimes smell (Chapple 2001: 209-210). While consciously killing an insect is acknowledged as intrinsically violent, and therefore a violation of the practice of *ahimsā*, there is a sliding scale of how serious the violation is considered. Harm (*himsā*) against insects is relative, where it is more acceptable for a farmer to use pesticides, killing thousands of insects and ultimately negatively effecting the entire food web in the area, than it is for a businessman to kill a single insect in his office (Oral Interview). The key to *ahimsā*'s relativity is necessity, where harm is undesirable through *ahimsā*, it is acceptable if there is a legitimate unavoidable need for it. The farmer must protect his or her crops in order to ensure a profitable harvest, while the businessman has no legitimate reason to harm the insect, according to Jain thought.

Another example of an acceptable level of violence comes from an observation at the Jain

Temple district of Hastinapur, in Uttar Pradesh, India. The Head of the Grounds had hired non-Jains to pull up the plants between the interlocking stones of the walking path⁸. When asked how he could justify the harm to these plants, an action prohibited by the law of *ahimsā*, he explained that he considered it to be an acceptable level of violence since killing such plants would not give him very much karma, and it was necessary for the aesthetics of the temple area (Oral Interview). For him, killing these plants to ensure the aesthetic of the temple district was a necessary violence, and therefore not a true violation of *ahimsā*.

The importance of the debate around acceptable violence is also found in the debate within Jainism on the use of flowers in Jain worship (*puja*). This debate exists in the split between Digambara and Svetambara Jains, where Svetambara Jains have incorporated flowers into their worship rituals while Digambara Jain consider the use of flowers to be violent (*himsic*). Svetambara Jains consider the harming of plants for the use of their flowers to be acceptable because the flowers, which were already picked by non-Jains, would be wasted if they are not used in worship in the Jain temple — the best possible use for a flower (Oral Interview). Digambara Jains, on the other hand, consider the harming of flowers simply for their use in ritual to be unnecessary violence, and instead use coloured grains of rice to symbolize flowers (Oral Interview). This debate over flowers between Svetambara and Digambara Jains represents how *ahimsā* is not a monolithic unchanging doctrine, but one that must be engaged and negotiated with based on the context and necessity of the action. In Jainism, violence is acceptable so long as its context makes the action necessary, or the violence is directed towards a lower order being. Deep ecology's use of *ahimsā* not only exists in a definitional vacuum, in which there is no concise definition of what is alive, but it exists in opposition to Jain *ahimsā* which is relative and

⁸ One can accrue karma by directing another to commit an action, supporting an action (either directly or through silent consent), or by carrying out in the action itself (Oral Interview)

based on context. Although Jain have largely based their ecological ideals on *ahimsā*, as the Jain Declaration on Nature stated, the discrepancies between the Jain representation of *ahimsā* and deep ecology's use of the term allows for only a superficial comparison between the two. Jain *ahimsā* must be considered within the complex relativism of Jain reality, where acceptable violence is measured based on necessity, while deep ecology uses the term in a ridged — albeit ill-defined — framework where violence is never acceptable. Ultimately, deep ecology cannot be related to Jainism based on the doctrine of *ahimsā*.

Chapter 3

Animal Liberation and a Jain Living World

The Jain world is full of life, in which humans, animals, plants, and elements (earth, air, water, and fire) are all considered to be alive. According to Donald Worster, the early twentieth century approach of ecologists towards creatures outside of the human realm was designed to provide a “more effective management of the plant and animal ‘industry’” rather than protect them from the harm of ecological destruction (Worster 2006: 295). Yet as environmentalism advanced “a critique of the human tendency to assert its own preeminence and to assume that the human species...can treat other species in any way it wishes” developed (Kinsley 1995: 180). This led ecologists to assert that there is an inherent value in other-than-human beings outside of their usefulness to humans (ibid 180). As this movement progressed, often articulated under the rubric of animal liberation or animal rights, scholars such as L. W. Sumner argued that environmental ethics must take into account the rights of non-human animals in order to develop “the beginning of a genuine environmental consciousness” (Sumner 1976: 164). Tom Regan goes beyond Sumner’s idea of an environmental consciousness and the rights of animals, and argues for deep ecology’s ethic of inherent value, which requires that the value associated with an other-than-human beings must derive from within it, not imposed upon it (Regan 1981: 30). Regan and Sumner’s principles of environmental consciousness and intrinsic value are articulated through deep ecology, which claims that, “all things in the biosphere have an equal right to live, blossom, and to reach their own individual form of unfolding and self realization” (Devall 1999: 201), or as Means (1987: 13) states, “Deep Ecology has always asserted that wilderness must be defended for its own sake, not for human gain”. Deep ecology argues that a being’s value leads to the ideal of biocentric egalitarianism, in other words, the ideal that all

beings have inherent value and right to life which results in an equality between all beings, where no one being is superior to another. As a result, deep ecology has “broadened the domain of discourse” between human interaction with non-human nature (McLaughlin 1987:2), allowing nature to take on value for itself which requires respect and protection from human harm.

The Value of Animals

This idea of inherent value for living things within the natural world is also found within Jainism’s *ahimsā*, which argues that all living beings deserve freedom from violence and interference, as well as “compassion, harmlessness, and respect for the sanctity of life in all forms” (Muniji 1995: 19). Jains agree that all living beings deserve respect and protection from violence through the doctrine of *ahimsā*, yet unlike deep ecology, Jains do not consider all beings to be equal, therefore contradicting deep ecology’s biocentric egalitarianism.

This idea of inherent value as a justification for a protectionist attitude towards the natural world is represented through the idea of animal rights and liberation. Jain animal rights groups have used the idea of value to protect animals in association with the doctrine of *ahimsā*. The Jain Declaration on Nature explains that, “transgressions against the vow of non-violence include all forms of cruelty to animals and human beings” (Singhvi 2010: 5). Although deep ecology and Jainism both suggest that animal rights must be protected, the two have a different understanding of what animal protection means. Not only do Jains have a structured hierarchy of the animal kingdom, which deep ecology rejects, but the animal shelters (*pinjrapoles*) that are

run by Jain philanthropic organizations do not fully protect animal in the manner in which deep ecology's ideal of inherent value requires.⁹

Living Beings on a Tiered Playing Field

As has been discussed previously, Jain cosmology has developed a highly complex taxonomy of living things, categorizing them into a hierarchy of five broad tiers based on how many of the five senses each organism processes. Those organisms that have only the first sense, touch, are known as one-sense beings, and include the elements and plants. The more senses the organism has, the more complex it is. With all five senses, the highest tier of the Jain taxonomy of living beings includes mammals, birds, reptiles, and humans. At the same time, humans are considered to be above the animal kingdom, because they also possess consciousness, and are therefore capable of achieving liberation from *samsāra* (Shah 1998: 4). The Jain Acaranga Sutra explains that “all breathing, existing, living, sentient creatures should not be slain nor treated with violence” (Acaranga Sutra 1.4.1). This Jain “vision of reality...results in a perception of a living cosmos and inspires an ecologically sensitive response on the part of the adherents to the Jain faith” (Chapple 2001: 207). Therefore the Jain attribution of life to all things, including elements, gives it “the potential to become a powerful force in defense of the environment”, not only towards plants and animals, but also in protection of water and air from pollution through industrial harm (Shah 1998: 31). The value of living things in the Jain cosmology does not develop out of an industrial-resource based worth, as Worster suggested (2006: 295), but out of the virtue of being alive. Where most ecological ethics extend to conscious beings, and some extend so far as to include plants into their framework of inherent value, the Jain cosmology goes

⁹ The controversy around *pinjrapoles* and their protection of animals from violence will be discussed in the concluding chapter, ‘So What, and Other Considerations’.

further by applying inherent value and consciousness to animals, plants, and elements. Although the Jain worldview imposes inherent value onto all living things, as deep ecology also does, Jains do not agree that the value of all life forms are the same, and, as a result, there is a hierarchy in the Jain web of being that conflicts with the deep ecology ethic of inherent value and biocentric egalitarianism towards animals. Specifically considering these deep ecology concepts of biocentric egalitarianism and inherent value through the lens of animal rights activism, Jainism's *pinjrapoles* demonstrate how Jainism fails to protect animals according to deep ecology's principles of biocentric egalitarianism.

Deep ecology's idea of inherent value is best expressed through the field of animals rights activism where deep ecology's 'own-being' theory argues that animals have the right to live out their lives free from human interference (Kinsley 1995: 182). For deep ecology, animal rights remain constant where "nature must always be protected" (Wenzel 2000:40). Ecce De Jonge writes about how deep ecology's ideal of biocentric egalitarianism prevents ecologists from harming one species in order to protect another. Such actions would imply that one living being or species possesses a higher value than another, a hierarchy that deep ecologists would not support. As De Jonge (2004: 134) explains: "if a level of care cannot be shown equally to all [living beings], but is restricted to only a few, than deep ecology is deemed wanting". This intense form of animal protection is represented in the example of Californian animal rights activists who protested the decision to put down feral cats that had begun to adversely effect the endangered bird population in the area (Barnhill and Gottlieb 2001: 7 & Mott 2004: 1). Deep ecologists applauded the activists' efforts to prevent the euthanization of the feral cat population, despite the negative effects that these cats were having on the rest of their ecosystem. Through deep ecology's theory of inherent value and biocentric egalitarianism as expressed in this

example, deep ecologists emphasized the idea of placing equal value on all species while rejecting a hierarchy of value in the animal kingdom. Jain animal protection, on the other hand, clearly does not consider the protection of animals to be equal, where Jain activism accepts that some animals are to be protected above, and at the expense of another. The manner in which Jains live out their strict protection of animals through *ahimsā* is presented in the way that Jain community groups have organized to protect animals: *pinjrapoles*.

Violent *Pinjrapoles*

Meat eating is considered to be the “biggest enemy of righteousness, purity and goodness” in Jainism (Gyansanga 2006: 9), and vegetarianism is one method that Jains have developed in an attempt to protect animals from harm and ensure their own positive karmic rebirth. Beyond vegetarianism, another concrete representation of Jain animal protection and “living *ahimsā*” is seen in the establishment of Jain *pinjrapoles* (animal shelters) (Oral Interview). The Mysore Pinjrapole Society in Mysore, Southern India describes its Mission Statement to: “Prevent Cow slaughter, protect cattle, shelter cattle, dogs, sheep, goats, horses, rabbits etc., that are weak and helpless, and provide, food, water, medical help to all animals” (Mysore Pinjrapole Society). *Pinjrapoles* are seen as an active representation of *ahimsā* since “it is the duty of human beings to act for animal welfare” (Shah 1998: 111, 224-226). Jain community groups often organize, run and fund, *pinjrapoles* that take in stray animals including cattle, elephants, dogs, and goats. These animals may be bought from meat markets by Jains and donated to the *pinjrapoles* to prevent them from going to slaughter, or injured animals that have been found around the city are brought to the shelters to be cared for (Tobias 1987). Most commonly, animals are brought to a *pinjrapole* because they are hurt, either having been injured,

or suffering from an illness. The Bird Hospital of New Delhi India is dedicated to the protection of Birds in the area and is run by the Digambara Jain community. Birds that are injured are brought to the shelter and treated and released, although many never leave choosing to spend the rest of their lives around the hospital. Until recently, and even now with only few exceptions, predatory birds were turned away from the hospital. Carnivorous birds are considered too aggressive, and the protection and care they would receive at the *pinjrapole* would legitimize and assist them in the violence they will later carry out (Oral Interview). As a rule *pinjrapoles* do not take in carnivorous animals, as they are violent and would require staff to provide live food for the patient. Therefore, such animals are regarded as secondary to herbivores within the Jain perception of animal value. *Pinjrapoles* are a lived representation of Jain ideal on animal protection in which a clear hierarchy between animals exists within the system. Deep ecology's biocentric egalitarianism rejects any instance where one species is valued over another. *Pinjrapoles* act as the living ethic of *ahimsā* and animal protection in Jainism, the reality of which does not relate to deep ecology's ideal of animal rights.

While the Jain animal protection through *pinjrapoles* may initially appear to adhere to the ethic of inherent value in deep ecology, the philosophy and actions towards animals do not. Biocentric egalitarianism suggests that living things, including plants and animals have inherent value and therefore should be protected in a manner where no one species takes precedence over another. Deep ecology requires a strict protection of animals beyond simply preventing harm, while Jains have a highly developed hierarchy between living beings. Therefore Jainism's lived representation of animal rights and *ahimsā*, through the establishment of *pinjrapoles*, does not equate to deep ecology's principle of inherent value and biocentric egalitarianism.

‘So What’ and Other Considerations

Arne Næss pioneered his developing ecological movement known as deep ecology and developed it into a comprehensive environmental campaign that approaches the natural world on a spiritual level and argues for its protection based on the inherent value of all organisms. Deep ecology’s view of the environment bases itself on a spiritual connection with the natural world that can be traced back to Næss himself, who claimed that deep ecologists needed to incorporate religious movements in their environmental support system in order to enhance the spiritual awareness of the ecological movement (qtd. in Dudley 2005: 21). Later theorists who used Næss framework made the argument that western religious movements were antithetical to deep ecology initiatives while ‘eastern’ or ‘Asian’ traditional were more inclined to environmental protectionism (Barnhill 2001:11). This reveals the first problem with the connection between deep ecology and religious movements, where ‘religion’ is presented as a monolith, and disturbing generalizations around Eastern traditions and their supposed inherent environmental ethos are upheld. Regardless of the misplaced alliance between ‘Asian religions’ and deep ecology’s emphasis on the usefulness of spirituality to address environmental problems, it is still invaluable to consider the usefulness of religion, as Cynthia Branton (2006:212) stated, to “motivate people” towards ecological solutions. Deep ecologists emphasize interdisciplinary and intercultural dialogue that stresses the first of their principles: to accept multiple viewpoints and cultural perspectives on environmental problems in order to arrive at appropriate and applicable solutions.

As Næss explained, human cultural diversity requires theoretical diversity and an acceptance of a multiplicity of viewpoints (Næss 2005 13: 229). Jainism is associated with deep ecology’s theoretical pluralism through the doctrine of *anekāntavāda*, or non-absolutism, which

similarly argues that multiple perspectives must always be considered. Yet, the Jain ideal of *anekāntavāda* exists within a hierarchy in which multiple and conflicting ideologies are tolerated, but are ultimately only accepted if they subscribe to Jain philosophy. *Anekāntavāda* claims to be pluralistic, but the lived application of the principle within Jainism explains that *anekāntavāda* holds a higher truth claim in which Jain ideas supersede all others. As a result, deep ecology and Jainism are not relatable through this doctrine.

Deep ecology has also been incorrectly related to Jainism through the doctrine of *parasparopagraho jivanam*, which argues that all beings are interconnected. Deep ecologists hold a similar ideal of a relationship between all living beings in the natural world, yet where deep ecology's biocentric egalitarianism argues that all of these interconnected organisms have equal value and right to life, Jain *parasparopagraho jivanam* exists within a hierarchy. Although deep ecologists agree that there is a need to protect all living beings from harm, they reject Jainism's hierarchical value between living beings. Therefore deep ecology and Jainism cannot be equated based on *parasparopagraho jivanam* and deep ecology's ideal of an interconnected natural world.

The Jain principle of *ahimsā* argues that all living organisms should not be harmed, and is represented as a doctrine of "tolerance and relativity" (Cort 2000: 324). *Ahimsā* is seen as a principle of protection towards all living beings, and is used by name in deep ecology. Næss was the first to employ the term *ahimsā* in deep ecology, and while he used it to describe an ideal of non-violence towards nature based on Mohandas Gandhi's description of *ahimsā*, later theorists fail to qualify the term, using it without fully defining it. *Ahimsā* is defined as protecting living beings from harm (Snyder 1995:240), yet deep ecologists do not discuss what is considered to be

alive. Although deep ecology has incorporated the word *ahimsā*, it does not reflect its Jain usage and, as a result, cannot be compared to deep ecology based their mutual use of the term.

In additional to the definitional problems related to *ahimsā*, deep ecologists also apply the term differently. Deep ecology rejects any harm to an animal even at the cost of another species, and present a monolithic unyielding representation of the term. Meanwhile, Jain *ahimsā* is relativistic, where appropriate non-violent actions are based on context. Looking specifically at the animal rights movement and the establishment of *pinjrapoles*, Jains present their doctrine of *ahimsā* as a rejection of harm based on the Jain hierarchy of being, where violence towards lower order beings is acceptable when considered in context. Deep ecology, on the other hand, does not consider any harm towards animal and other living beings to be acceptable. Deep ecology's use of the term *ahimsā* does not reflect a Jain understanding of the doctrine, and accordingly, Jain *ahimsā* and the non-violent ideal of deep ecology do not equate.

A critical reflection on Jain doctrine and deep ecology theory presents a problematic correlation between the two. Although Jainism and deep ecology may appear to be related based on a superficial understanding of the two fields, when more carefully considered, the Jain doctrines of *anekāntavāda*, *parasparopagraho jivanam*, and *ahimsā* do no relate to deep ecology's principles of theoretical pluralism, interconnectedness, and *ahimsā*, respectively. For these reasons, Jainism is not an inherent deep ecological religion.

Despite the fact that Jainism and deep ecology do not equate, the usefulness of Jain doctrinal principles to ecological protection extends beyond its applicability to deep ecology theory. Aspects of Jain philosophy can be seen in contemporary environmental movements.

The Jain doctrines of *anekāntavāda*, *parasparopagraho jīvānām* and *ahimsā* reflect the core values of this ancient faith community, and although they do not adhere to deep ecology's

principles for ecological protection, they are nonetheless valuable to contemporary environmental ethics. Modern environmental problems can, and are, addressed through a philosophy similar to that found in Jainism, and while Jain ideals towards ecology are not used by name, their general sense permeates contemporary environmental movements. Not only do large environmental organizations use Jain principles, but modern Jains have also reinterpreted Jainism in order to use its philosophy towards environmental goals. This reimagining of Jainism follows a neo-orthodox philosophy in which Jain religious values are interpreted for a western context. Redeveloped Jain doctrines are found in the contemporary dialogue around Jainism and ecology, as well as in new ecological movements within Jainism that are directed towards animal protectionism.

If not Deep Ecology, than perhaps Environmentalism

To begin, Jain environmental ideals of protectionism towards plants and animals, and the recognition of the interdependent relationship between all living organisms compares to the missions of large scale international environmental organizations. The World Wildlife Foundation's vision statement on the preservation of species includes the recognition of the a relationship between all living organisms as an essential part of protecting them from extinction:

The interdependent relationships among land, sea and species support vast populations of migratory and resident wildlife. From the tiniest plankton to the great Arctic icons, the polar bear and walrus, this region is teeming with wildlife. Fish, foxes, birds, whales, brown bears, reindeer and seals abound. (WWF)

Likewise, Greenpeace's mission statement is known as the Declaration of Interdependence, and as its name suggests, it is based on an ideal of the interdependence of living beings reminiscent

of the Jain doctrine of *parasparopagraho jīvānām*. Greenpeace's Declaration contains three Laws of Ecology which state that "all forms of life are interdependent", and that this ecological complexity results in a healthy and sustainable environment (Weyler 2010). Meanwhile, Conservation International's core values reflect a non-violent recognition of respect for a diversity of cultures and the continued protection humans are required to provide to the environment: "We respect and trust each other, and we embrace the diversity of our cultures, talents, and experiences." (Conservation International). Conservation International argues that environmental initiatives are dependent on the complexity of human culture, and by tapping in to the diversity of philosophies and values, humans can develop solutions in the large-scale ecological crises. This ideal for intercultural dialogue reflects the importance of being able to accept and accommodate alternate or contradictory viewpoints, similar to the Jain ideal of *anekāntavāda*. As a last example, the Defenders of Wildlife, an international animal protection agency, explains that their Action Fund "champions those laws and lawmakers that protect wildlife and wild places while working against those that do them harm" (Defenders of Wildlife). The Defenders of Wildlife reject any harm done to animals or the environment as incompatible to ecological sustainability, and fight to end violence against the natural world. Their original manifestation as the Defenders of Fur Bearers specifically focused on the protection of wild animals, yet has now expanded to include "wildlife habitat and biodiversity, protecting wild animals, especially large carnivores, remains a central part of our mission" (Defenders of Wildlife). This shift to protect the habitat as well as the animal from harm further reflects the recognition of the interdependence of animals, the natural environment, and the entire ecosystem, as well as the Jain ideal of non-violence towards living beings.

Although international environmental activist organizations reflect the ecological doctrines of Jainism — the need for cooperative work and respect for other cultures in order to produce substantial change in defending the environment (*anekāntavāda*), the interconnection of the natural world (*parasparopagraho Jīvānām*), and the requirement of protecting living organisms from harm (*ahimsā*) — this reflection is a simplistic understanding of Jain ideals towards environmentalisms. This does not imply that environmental movements cannot borrow from Jainism, or that Jainism cannot lend itself to ecological initiatives, simply that an orthodox understanding of Jainism does not reflect the ideals of deep ecology as presented in environmental activism. A reimagining of these same doctrines by contemporary Jains has begun in the diaspora community in order to accommodate a western context as well as to enforce the developing ecological initiatives within Jainism¹⁰.

A Neo-Orthodox Reminaginig of Jainism

Removed from their exact representations in Jainism and reimagined for the western world, diaspora Jains apply a neo-orthodox adaptation of the Jain ideals to environmental practices. As Cort explains, diaspora Jains are interested in ecological movements (Cort “Green Jainism” 2002: 64), or as Anne Vallely states: “They [diaspora Jains] emphasize the values of vegetarianism, animal rights, environmentalism, meditation, and nonsectarianism and actively promote interfaith activites” (Vallely 2002: 194). Marcus Banks (1991: 244-257) examines the division of Jainism into the categories of orthodox, heterodox, and neo-orthodox. Orthodox Jainism is described as the representation of Jainism within India, rooted in the ritual and asceticism of traditional Indian Jains, while heterodoxy is a theistic Jainism, in which customary

¹⁰ Ecological ideals have begun to dominate the discussions within Jain conferences (Folkert and Cort 1997).

ideas of religion based on a western understanding of the term produces the belief in a ‘supreme God’. Heterodox Jainism has developed as an attempt by diaspora Jains to gain credibility as a ‘valid religious system’ next to Christianity and Hinduism (Banks 1991: 248). Neo-orthodoxy, on the other hand, clings to science for legitimacy, where science replaces the ascetics of orthodoxy, and is applied to traditional Jain ideals to give them authority in the west. Jains have begun to cite modern environmental science as a Jain creation, where the environmental aspects of Jain doctrine are considered to predate, and in some aspects, inform western science (Banks 1991: 252). As one Jain worshiper at the Hastinapur Temple district clearly stated: “Not only are plants and trees alive, but they provide for us and we rely on them. Jains have always known this and science is now saying the same thing” (Oral Correspondence). Anne Vallely deconstructs the relationship between diaspora Jainism and its association with contemporary environmentalism, and explains that these new diasporic developments “reflect a shift in ethical orientation away from a traditional orthodox liberation-centric ethos to a sociocentric or “ecological” one” (Vallely 2002: 195). Diaspora Jains follow a neo-orthodox interpretation of Jainism where ecological initiatives are highly developed and protected within Jainism.

Western Jain groups reflect this new ethic through their community initiatives and ecological programs. HereNow4U, an online Jain activist and web magazine, was developed by Jains in recognition of the need for a renewed approach to Jainism in a new context. Aparigraha Jain, a cofounder of the organization explains that “our world view has changed, our world demands a new approach to keep it going” (Jain 2008). The Jain Way of Life, a North American Jain organization, considers the evolution of Jain practices and ethics to be the future of Jains in North America. In their Vision for 2020, the first of their four goals is to evolve their religious practices in order to avoid “extinction” in the new geographic and cultural context of North

America (Jains in North America). Meanwhile, the youth organization, Young Jains of the United Kingdom, has dedicated itself to further the “understanding [of] Jain principles, ethics, [and] the environment”, recognizing that Jainism is not only related to environmentalism, but its ethics can be used in developing solutions to protecting it as well (Young Jains). This reexamination of Jainism takes on a neo-orthodox approach to Jain doctrines, in which Jain ethics are understood in light of their new context, and scientific developments, especially in the food industry. One of the overarching changes to Jainism has been their approach to *ahimsā* in light of animal protection through the adoption of a fully vegan diet over their traditional vegetarian diet. Although their application of *ahimsā* is not comparable to the traditional Jain understanding of the term, this neo-orthodox reconstruction can be applied to environmentalist movement within the Jain community.

As has previously been discussed, Jain *ahimsā* is context based, in which what is considered to be acceptable non-violent actions towards a living being depends upon the circumstances of the situation. A neo-orthodox reimagining of *ahimsā* in the diaspora Jain community applies to Jain dietary restrictions and the perceived violence towards cows in the consumption of dairy products. Orthodox Jainism considers dairy products to be an acceptable part of the Jain diet, where taking milk from an animal is not considered to be violence against that animal. A defense of the traditional Jain diet argues that since a calf must first suckle from its mother in order for milk production to begin, the calf gets all the milk that it needs. So long as humans do not take milk away from the calf, there is no violence towards animals through the consumption of dairy products (Oral Interview). Considering the contemporary dairy market, a minority of Jains, especially those in the diaspora, have adopted a completely vegan diet in response to the perceived violence of the westernized dairy production industry (Oral Interview).

Veganism is considered to be a more environmentally conscious diet for Jains who are aware of the violence towards dairy cows. JAINA, the Federation of Jain Associations of North America, has established the Jain Eco-Vegan initiative, while a variety of Jain Vegan webgroups have sprung up in order to promote a vegan lifestyle within the Jain community (JAINA). Although still a minority movement within western Jainism, veganism is especially appealing to young Jains, who are particularly interested in preventing unnecessary harm to dairy cattle (Vallely 2002: 205). *Jain Teenagers in America and Beyond's Journal* discusses the challenges of living as a truly vegan Jain. With the additional restriction of avoiding root vegetables (a staple in most vegan food products), to be a "truly vegan Jain" is especially hard. Yet as Sabina explains in her *Journal* entry, "I will never be 100% pure but 95% is better than the 60% I am at now" (*Jain Teenagers in America*). Despite the challenge, Sabina considers veganism to be the appropriate evolution of her diet in order to fulfill the Jain ethic of non-violence. Contemporary Jains are reconsidering what is acceptable violence towards animals based on the developing technological environment in which they find themselves. Their new interpretation of *ahimsā* provides a distinct and innovative environmental movement within western Jainism.

On a similar note, a growing controversy over the construction and maintenance of *pinjrapoles* has developed within the Jain community, and, as a result, a reconsideration of *ahimsā* towards animals. Although many *pinjrapoles* employ veterinarians and staff to feed and address the animals' medical needs, Jains reject euthanasia, a common practice in western veterinary medicine, as violence against animals, and therefore Jain *pinjrapoles* allow animals to continue to live although they may be in pain. A veterinarian from the Digambara Bird Hospital in New Delhi explained that killing one of the birds, regardless of their injuries or perceived pain, would interfere in the animal's *dharma*, and would therefore be a violation of *ahimsā* (Oral

Interview). Contemporary Jains are especially critical of the prohibition against euthanasia as a highly violent act towards animals, which allows them to live in pain. Some Jains consider *ahimsā*'s philosophy of non-interference to preclude *pinjrapoles*, which unnecessarily interferes in the lives of animals, and “focus solely on the protection of life and not with the alleviation of animal suffering” (Vallely 2002: 207-208). *Pinjrapoles* were originally developed as a lived expression of *ahimsā* (Shah 1998: 111, 224-226), yet a diasporic reimaging of the term suggests that euthanasia would be a better expression of the doctrine. Modern Jains are not the only individuals to reconsider the effectiveness of *pinjrapoles*. Mohandas Gandhi was especially critical of *pinjrapoles* during his time, and was quoted as saying: “Most of [India's] *pinjrapoles* are ill managed and ill kept. Instead of being a real blessing to the animal world, they are perhaps simple receiving depots for dying animals”. Gandhi considered *pinjrapoles* to be a destructive, rather than a protective, force towards animals. Although developed and run by Jains, Gandhi did not agree that animals were being treated well in them. Within the India community, a Svetambara Jain explained to me that she considered *pinjrapoles* to be an unnecessary interference in an animal's life. Animals at *pinjrapoles* are kept alive while they are in pain to satisfy the Jains who protect them (Oral Interview)¹¹. Due to the inherent value of all life and the ethic of non-violence, diaspora Jains have begun to critique the building of *pinjrapoles* as contradictory to the principles of *ahimsā*. Animal rights have taken up a large part of the Jain neo-orthodox reinterpretation of *ahimsā*, where *pinjrapoles* are being reexamined and excluded from the diasporic Jain preview of animal protection.

¹¹ In this interview, this Svetambara Jain was specifically critiquing a particular Jain *pinjrapole* run by a Digumbara community group in Mumbai, and due to the sectarian divisions within Jainism, it should be noted that her comments could have been influenced by sectarian divisions rather than a real concern for the animals themselves.

This contemporary reinterpretation of Jain philosophy around *ahimsā*, reflects the developing ecological awareness around animal rights and environmental protection within modern Jainism. A neo-orthodox view of Jainism allows for a reimagining of Jain philosophy into a western context, and provides further opportunity for Jain principles to be applied to environmental movements. Diaspora Jain groups address the issue of ecology and animal rights based on Jain principles, while ecological initiatives outside of Jainism use similar principles to govern their environmental movements. Although there is no clear relationship between Jain philosophy and deep ecology, the use of Jain thinking by ecological initiatives (both within and outside of Jainism itself) shows that Jain philosophy is important, and can be used, towards solutions to environmental problems. Deep ecology and orthodox Jainism may not be compatible, yet Jain ideals are nonetheless well suited with contemporary environmentalism, and their philosophy can lend itself to positive changes within ecological initiatives.

Work Cited

- Babb, Lawrence A. 2006. "The Jain Community" In *The Oxford Handbook of Global Religions*, ed. Mark Juergensmeyer. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- . 1996. *Absent Lord: Ascetics and Kings in a Jain Ritual Culture*. England: University of California Press.
- . 1994. "The Great Choice: Worldly Values in a Jain Ritual Culture" *History of Religions* 34.1: 15-38.
- Badlani, Hiro G. 2008. *Hinduism: Path of the Ancient Wisdom*. USA: iUniverse.
- Banks, Marcus. 1991. "Orthodoxy and Dissent: Varieties of Religious Belief among Immigrant Gujarati Jains in Britain" In *The Assembly of Listeners: Jains in Society*, ed. Michael Carrithers & Caroline Humphrey. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Barnhill, David Landis & R. Gottlieb. 2001. "Introduction" In *Deep Ecology and World Religions: New Essays on Sacred Grounds*, ed. David Landis Barnhill, Roger S. Gottlieb. New York: University of New York Press.
- Bennett, David & Richard Sylvan. 1987. "Deep Ecology and Green Politics" *Trumpeter* 4.2: 16-19.
- Bhuvanbhanusuri, Acarya Vijay. 1989. *Ganadharavāda*. trans. K Ramappa. New Delhi: Motilal Barnasidass Publishers Private Limited.
- Bingham, Nick, Andrew Blowers & Chris Belshaw, ed. 2003. *Contested Environments*. Chichester: Wiley in association with the Open University.
- Branton, Cynthia. 2006. "An Introduction to Religion and Ecology" *Environmental Practice* 8.4: 212-214.
- Callicott, J. Baird. 1994. *Earth's Insights: a Survey of Ecological Ethics from the Mediterranean Basin to the Australian Outback*. London: University of California Press.
- . 1990. "The Case Against Moral Pluralism" *Environmental Ethics* 12.2: 99-124.
- Chakrabarty, Bidyut. 2006. *Social and Political Thought of Mahatma Gandhi*. New York: Routledge.
- Chapple, Christopher Key. 2007. "Jainism and Nonviolence" In *Subverting Hatred: The Challenge of Nonviolence in Religious Traditions*, ed. Daniel L. Smith-Christopher. New York: Orbis Books.

- , 2007. "Purgation and Virtue in Jainism: Towards an Ecological Ethic" In *Indian Ethics: Classical Traditions and Contemporary Challenge*, ed. Puruottama Bilimoria, Joseph Prabhu, Renuka M. Sharma. England: Ashgate Publishing Ltd.
- , 2003. "Jainism and Buddhism" In *A companion to Environmental Philosophy*, ed. Dale Jamieson. Massicusetts, Oxford, Victoria: Blackwell Publishing Limited.
- , ed. 2002. *Jainism and Ecology: Nonviolence in the Web of Life*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- , 2002. "Jainism and Ecology" In *When Worlds Converge: What Science and Religion Tells us about the Story of the Universe and Our Place in It*, ed. C. Matthews, M Tucker and P. Hefner. Chicago & La Salle, Illinois: Open Court.
- , 2001 "The Living Cosmos of Jainism: A Traditional Science Grounded in Environmental Ethics" *Daedalus* 130.4: 207-224.
- , 1993. *Nonviolence to Animals, Earth, and Self in Asian Traditions*. Albany, NY: State of New York University Press.
- Charitrapargya, Samani. 2004. "Mahavira, Anekanteada and the World Today" In *Ahimsā, Anekanta and Jainism*, ed. Tara Sethia. New Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas Publishing Private Limited.
- Coates, John, Mel Gray & Tiani Heatherington. 2006. "An Ecospiritual Perspective: Finally, a Place for Indigenous Approaches" *British Journal of Social Work* 36: 381-399.
- Cohen, Mafia Luisa. 1991. "Sacred Spaces: Beyond the Concept of Resource-Exploitation" *The Environmentalist* 11.1. 55-61.
- Conservation International. 2010. *Values*. Available at http://www.conservation.org/discover.mission_strategy.Pages.values.aspx. Accessed August 21, 2010.
- Cort, John E. 2002. "Green Jainism? Notes and Queries toward a possible Jain Environmental Ethic" In *Jainism and Ecology: Nonviolence in the web of life*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- , 2002. "Singing the Glory of Asceticism: Devotion and Asceticism in Jainism" *Journal of American Academy of Religion* 70.4: 719-742.
- , 2001. *Jains in the World: Religious Values and Ideology in India*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- , 2000. "Intellectual Ahimsā" Revisited: Jain Tolerance and Intolerance of Others" *Philosophy East and West* 50.3: 324-347.

- Craig, Edward, ed. 1998. *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy: Nihilism to Quantum Mechanics, volume seven*. New York: Taylor and Francis.
- Cush, Denise. 1999. "Learning From the Concept and Concepts of a Religious Tradition: Jainism in the RE curriculum" *Journal of Beliefs & Values* 20.1: 60-74.
- Davies, Christie. 1999. "The Fragmentation of the Religious Tradition of the Creation, After-Life and Morality: Modernity not Post-Modernity" *Journal of Contemporary Religion* 14.3: 339 – 360.
- Defenders of Wildlife. 2010. "What does Defenders of Wildlife Action Fund do?" Available at http://www.defenders.org.about_us.faqs.general.php. Accessed August 21, 2010.
- De Jonge, Eddy. 2004. *Spinoza and Deep Ecology: Challenging Traditional Approaches to Environmentalism*. Great Britain: Ashgate Publishing.
- Deleu, Jozef. 1996. *Viyahapannatti*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers Private Limited.
- Devall, Bill & George Sessions. 1999. "Deep Ecology" In *Thinking Through the Environment: A Reader*, ed. Mark J. Smith. London: Routledge.
- Devall, Bill. 1992. *American Environmentalism: The U.S. Environmental Movement; 1970-1990*, ed. Riley E. Dunlap & Angela G. Mertig. Washington D.C.: Taylor and Francis, Ltd.
- . 1985. *Deep Ecology: Living as if Nature Mattered*. Salt Lake City, Utah: Peregrine Smith Books.
- Dudley, Nigel, Liza Higgins-Zogib, & Stephanie Mansourian. 2005. *Beyond Belief: Linking Faiths and Protected Areas to Support Biodiversity Conservation*, Switzerland & United Kingdom: WWF.ARC. Available at http://www.panda.org/about_our_earth.all_publications.?58880.Beyond-Belief-Linking-faiths-and-protected-areas-for-biodiversity-conservation. Accessed July 9, 2010.
- Dundas, Paul. 2002. "Limits of a Jain Environmental Ethic" In *Jainism and Ecology: Non-violence in the Web of Life*, ed. Christopher Chapple. USA: Harvard University Press.
- . 1992. *The Jains*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Dwivedi, O. P. 2003. "Classical India" In *A Companion to Environmental Philosophy*, ed. Dale Jamieson. Blackwell: Oxford.
- Eck, Diane. *Darsan: Seeing the Divine Image in India*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1996.

- Edelglass, William. 2006. "Moral Pluralism, Skillful Means, and Environmental Ethics" *Environmental Philosophy* 3:8-16.
- Folkert, Kert & John Cort. 1997. "Jainism" In *The New Handbook of Living Religions*, ed. John R. Hinnells. New York: Blackwell Online Resources.
- Forum on Religion and Ecology. Available at <http://www.religionandecology.org>. Accessed August 3, 2010.
- Fox, Warwick. 2003. "Deep Ecology: A New Philosophy of Our Time?" In *Environmental ethics: an Anthology*, ed. Andrew Light & Holmes Rolston. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Limited.
- , 1992. "Intellectual Origins of the Depth Theme in the Philosophy of Arne Næss" *Trumpeter* 9.2: 68–73.
- Gandhi, Mohandas. 2005. *Hindu Dharma*. Delhi: Orient Paperbacks.
- Gandhi, Rajmohan. 2008. *The Man, His People, and the Empire*. Great Britain: University of California Press.
- Gayford, Chris. 1993. "Environmental Education" In *Cross Curricular Contexts, Themes and Dimensions in Secondary Schools, volume two*, ed. Gajendra K. Verma & Peter David Pumfrey. London: Falmer Press.
- Gier, Nicholas F. 2004. *The Virtue of Nonviolence: from Gautama to Gandhi*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Glasser, Harold. 2005. "Series Editor's Introduction" In *The Selected Works of Arne Næss, volume one*, ed. Harold Glasser & Alan Drengson. Netherlands: Springer Netherlands.
- Golley, Frank B. 1999. "Environmental Attitudes in North America" In *Thinking Through the Environment: A Reader*, ed. Mark J. Smith. London: Routledge.
- Goswami, Amit. 2000. *The Physicists' View of Nature, Part 1: From Newton to Einstein*. New York: Plenum Publishers.
- Gottlieb, R. 2001. "Spiritual Deep Ecology and World Religions: A Shared Fate, A Shared Task" In *Deep Ecology and World Religions: New Essays on Sacred Grounds*, ed. David Landis Barnhill, Roger S. Gottlieb. New York: University of New York Press.
- Gulati, Mahinder N. 2008. *Comparative Religions and Philosophies: Anthropomorphism And Divinity*. New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers.

- Gyansagar. 2006. *Burning Issues: Cool Solutions* – Pamphlet, trans. J. K. Jain. Delhi: Prachya Shraman Bhari.
- Haigh, Martin. 2006. “Deep Ecology Education: Learning from its Vaisnava Roots” *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education* 11: 43-56.
- Jacobsen, Knut A. 2000. “Bhagavadgits, Ecosophy T, and Deep Ecology” In *Beneath the Surface, Critical Essays in the Philosophy of Deep Ecology*, ed. Eric Katz, Andrew Light & David Rothenberg. Massachusetts: Crane Composition, Inc.
- Jain, Aparigraha. 2008. HereNow4U “About” Available at <http://www.herenow4u.net/index.php?id=63788> Accessed August 21, 2010.
- Jain, Andrea R. & Jeffrey J. Kripal 2009. “Quietism and Karma: Non-Action as Non-Ethics in Jain Asceticism” *Common Knowledge* 15.2: 197-207.
- Jain, Kailash Chand. 1991. *Lord Mahāvīra and His Times*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Jain, Hira Lal. *This is Jainism* - Pamphlet. Delhi: Veetrag printers.
- Jain, L.C. 2004. “Getting to know Jainism in the Context of a Warring 21st Century” *Preparing for Peace Project-Supplementary Papers*. Westmorland General Meeting; September 14, 2004. Available at www.preparingforpeace.org. Accessed July 20, 2010.
- Jain Teenagers in America and Beyond. *Web Journal*. Available at <http://community.livejournal.com/jainteens>. Accessed July 20, 2010.
- JAINA. Federation of Jain Associations of North America. Available at www.jaina.org. Accessed August 20, 2010.
- Jains in North America. 2010. Vision for 2020: White Paper and Presentation. Available at <http://jaina.pbworks.com.Vision2020+White+Paper+and+Presentation>. Accessed August 21, 2010.
- Katz, Eric. 2000. “Against the Inevitability of Anthropocentrism” In *Beneath the surface: critical essays in the philosophy of deep ecology*, ed. Eric Katz, Andrew Light, David Rothenberg. USA: The MIT Press.
- King, Anna S. 1996. “Spirituality: Transformation and Metamorphosis” *Religion* 26: 343–51.
- Kinsley, David. 1995. *Ecology and Religion: Ecological Spirituality and Cross Cultural Perspective*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Kumar, Satish. 2002. “Jain Ecology” In *Jainism and Ecology: Nonviolence in the Web of Life*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

- Laidlaw, James. 1995. *Riches and Renunciation: Religion, Economy and Society among the Jains*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Light, Andrew. 2000. "Callicott and Næss on Pluralism" In *Beneath the Surface, Critical Essays in the Philosophy of Deep Ecology*, ed. Eric Katz, Andrew Light & David Rothenberg. Massachusetts: Crane Composition, Inc.
- Marshall, Peter H. 1996. *Nature's Web: Rethinking Our Place on Earth*. Great Britain: Paragon House Publishers.
- Mathews, Freya. 1995. "Conservation and self-Realization: A Deep Ecology Perspective" In *The Deep Ecology Movement: An Introductory Anthology*, ed. Alan R. Drengson & Yuichi Inoue. California: North Atlantic Books.
- Matilal, Bimal Krishna. 1981. "The Central Philosophy of Jainism (Anekanta-vada)" In *L.D. Series 79*. Ahmedabad : L.D. Institute of Indology. Qtd. John E. Cort. 2000. "Intellectual Ahimsā Revisited: Jain Tolerance and Intolerance of Others" *Philosophy East and West* 50.3: 324-347.
- Mayer, John. 1985. "The Role of the Jaina Heritage in Today's World" In *Perspectives in Jaina Philosophy and Culture*, ed. Satish Kumar Jain & Kamal Chand Segani. New Delhi: Ahimsā International.
- McLaughlin, Andrew. 1987. "The Critique of Humanity and Nature: Three Recent Philosophical Reflections" *Trumpeter* 4.4: 1-7.
- Means, Christopher. 1987. "Deep Ecology as Revolutionary Thought" *Trumpeter* 4.2: 12-14.
- Mehta, Mohan Lal. 2004. "Antiquity and History" In *Cultural and Religious Heritage of India: Jainism*, ed. Suresh K. Sharma, Usha Sharma. Delhi: Krishna Mittal.
- Merchant, Carolyn qtd. Andrew McLaughlin. 1990. "Nature as Matter: Science" In *Regarding Nature: Industrialism and Deep Ecology*. Albany: University of New York Press.
- Misra, Girishwar. 2009. "Non-Violence: An Imperative for a Flourishing Collective Life" *Psychological Studies* 54.
- Nadkarni, N. M. 2002. "When Preaching to the Choir Isn't Preaching to the Choir: Churches, Trees, and Environmental Perspectives" *Environmental Practice* 4.4: 188-190.
- Moolakkattu, John S. 2010. "Gandhi as a Human Ecologist" *Journal of Human Ecology* 29.3: 151-158.
- Mott, Maryann. 2004. "U.S. Faces Growing Feral Cat Problem" *National Geographic News*. September 7: 1-2.

- Muniji, Shiv. 1995. *The Jain Tradition*. India: Sanskar Jain Patrika & Baghwan Mahvir Meditation Research Centre Trust.
- Mysore *Pinjrapole* Society. "Our vision Mission and Objectives" Available at <http://...mysorepinjrapolesociety.org.Vision.htm>. Accessed August 20, 2010.
- Næss, Arne. 2005. *Selected Works for Arne Næss, volumes 1-10*. Springer: New York.
- 1989. *Ecology Community and Lifestyle: Outline of an Ecosophy*, ed. trans. David Rothenberg. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 1986. *Self-Realisation: An Ecological Approach to Being in the World*. Perth: Murdoch University.
- 1984. "A Defence of the Deep Ecology Movement" *Environmental Ethics* 6.3: 265-270.
- 1973. "The Shallow and the Deep, Long-Range Ecology Movement: A Summary" *Inquiry* 16: 95-100.
- Newton, Tim J. 2002. "Creating the New Ecological Order? Elias and Actor-Network Theory" *The Academy of Management Review* 27.4: 523-540.
- Padmanaloh S Jaini. 1979. *The Jaina Path of Purification*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Pedersen, Paul. 2004. "Nature Religion and Cultural Identity: The Religious Environmentalist Paradigm" In *Asian Perceptions of Nature: A Critical Approach*, ed. Ole Bruun & Arne Kalland. United Kingdom: Nordic Institute of Asian Studies.
- Raj Pruthi. 2004. *Jainism and Indian Civilization*. New Delhi: Discovery Publishing House.
- Radhakrishnan S. 2004. "Mahavira and His Religion" In *Indian Religion*, Rpt. in *Cultural and Religious Heritage of India: Jainism*, ed. Usha Sharma. New Delhi: Mittal Publication.
- Rankin, Aidan. 2009. *Many-Sided Wisdom: A New Politics of the Spirit*. United Kingdom: O Books, Ltd.
- Regan, Tom. 1981. "The Nature and Possibility of an Environmental Ethic" *Environmental Ethics* 3.1: 19-34.
- Rockefeller, Steven C. & John C Elder. 1992. "Introduction" In *Spirit and Nature: Why the Environment is a Religious Issue*, ed. Steven C. Rockefeller & John C. Elder. Massachusetts: Beacon Press.
- Rothenberg, David. 2002. *Always the Mountains*. Georgia: University of Georgia Press.

- Roof, Wade Clark. 1993. *A Generation of Seekers*. San Francisco: Harper.
- Sangave, Vilas Adinath. 2001. *Facets of Jainology: Selected Research Papers on Jain Society, Religion, and Culture*. New Delhi: Ramdas Bhatkal.
- Serguei, Krivov. 2002. "Eco-Rationality and Jain Karma Theory" In *Jaina: Philosophy, Art and Science in the Indian Culture; volume three*, ed. D.C. Jain and R. K. Sharma. Delhi: Sharada Publishing House.
- Sessions, George. 1995. "Arne Næss and the Union of Theory Practice" In *The Deep Ecology Movement: An Introductory Anthology*, ed. Alan R. Drengson & Yuichi Inoue. California: North Atlantic Books.
- Sessions, George. 1987. "The Deep Ecology Movement: A Review" *Environmental Review* 11.2: 105-125.
- Shah, Kokila H. 2008. "Relevance of Non-Violence in the Modern World with Special Reverence to Jainism" In papers for the *National Seminar on Indian Philosophy: It's Relevance to the 21st Century*. 18th-19th January 2008. Available at www.upmthane.org. Lecture Paper. Accessed August 21, 2010.
- Shah, Natubhai. 1998. *Jainism: The World of Conquerors, volume two*. Portland: Sussex Academic Press.
- Singh, Narendra. 2001. *Encyclopaedia of Jainism, volume 1*. New Delhi: Anmol Publication Private Limited.
- Singh, Upinder. 2008. *History of Ancient and Early Medieval India: From the Stone Age to the Twenty-First Century*. India: Pearson Publishing.
- Singhvi, L. M. 2010. *Jain Declaration on Nature*. Jainology Institute. Available at <http://www.jainology.org/publications/jain-declaration-on-nature>. Accessed June 30, 2002.
- "Appendix: The Jain Declaration on Nature" In *Jainism and Ecology: Non-violence in the Web of Life*, ed. Christopher Chapple. USA: Harvard University Press.
- Snyder, Gary. 1995. "Ecology, Place and the Awakening of Compassion" In *The Deep Ecology Movement: An Introductory Anthology*, ed. Alan R. Drengson & Yuichi Inoue. California: North Atlantic Books.
- Stack, George J. 1991. "Kant, Lange and Nietzsche: Critique of Knowledge" In *Nietzsche and Modern German Thought*, ed. Keith Ansell-Pearson. London: Routledge.
- Sumner, L. S. 1976. "A Matter of Life and Death" *Nous* 10: 145-71.

- Sylvan, Richard. 1995. "Critique of Deep Ecology" In *Sociology of the Environment, volume three*, ed. Radcliff Woodgate. Vermont: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.
- Taylor, Bron. 2001. "Earth and Nature-Based Spirituality (Part I): From Deep Ecology to Radical Environmentalism" *Religion* 31: 175–193.
- Tobias, Michael. 2004. "Forward" In *Ahimsā, Anekanta and Jainism*, ed. Tara Sethia. New Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas Publishing Private Limited.
- , 1996. "Anthropology of Conscience" *Society and Animals* 4.1: 65-73.
- , dir. 1987. *Ahimsā: Non-Violence*. Public Broadcasting Services. Film.
- Tucker, Mary Evelyn & John A. Grim, eds. 1994. *Worldviews and Ecology: Religion, Philosophy, and the Environment*. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books.
- UNEP-United Nations Environmental Programme. 2000. "The Assisi Declaration" In *Earth and Faith: A Book of Reflection for Action*. Nairobi, Kenya: UNEP.
- Vallely, Anne. 2002. *Guardians of the Transcendent: An Ethnography of a Jain Ascetic Community*. Toronto: Toronto Press, Inc.
- , 2002. "From Liberation to Ecology: Ethical Discourses Among Orthodox and Diaspora Jains" In *Jainism and Ecology: Nonviolence in the Web of Life*, ed. Christopher Chapple. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Van Voorst, Robert. 2003. *Anthology of World Scriptures, fourth edition*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Thompson Learning.
- Watson, Richard A. 1983. "A Critique of Anti-Anthropocentric Biocentrism" *Environmental Ethics* 5.3: 245-56.
- Weyler, Rex. 2010. "Deep Green: The Greenpeace Manifesto" Available at <http://www.greenpeace.org.international/en/about/deep-green/deep-green-special-1>. Accessed August 21, 2010.
- Weber, Thomas. 1999 "Gandhi, Deep Ecology, Peace Research and Buddhist Economics" *Journal of Peace Research* 36.3: 349-361.
- Wenzel, George W. 2000. *Animal Rights, Human Rights: Ecology, Economy, and Ideology in the Canadian Arctic*. Toronto, Ontario: University of Toronto Press.
- Worster, Donald. 2006. *Nature's Economy: A History of Ecological Ideas, second edition*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

WWF (World Wildlife Fund). 2010. *Mission Statement on Arctic Wildlife protection*. Available at <http://www.worldwildlife.org/what/wherewework/arctic>. Accessed August 21, 2010.

Yearley, Steven. 1996. *Sociology, Environmentalism, Globalization: Reinventing the Globe*. London & Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

Young Jains UK. *About Young Jains*. Available at <http://www.youngjains.org.uk/about>. Accessed August 21, 2010.

Zaehner, R.C. 1998. *Encyclopedia of the World's Religions*. USA: Helicon Publishing Ltd.

Curriculum Vitae

Education	2010	M.A. Religion and Modernity; Queen's University
	2009	B.A. Religious Studies; University of Ottawa
Experience	2009-10	Teaching Assistant, Department of Religious Studies, Queen's University
	2008-9	Editor/Contributor, The Oracle-Undergrad Student Association of Religious Studies Journal, University of Ottawa