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ABSTRACT

Islam is often regarded as a religion that teaches anthropocentrism through the concept of the caliph in which humans occupy a central position on earth. However, the concept of the caliph itself is a complex concept where the special status of humans always implies a moral obligation. Through alternative explanatory methods and critical reflection, the authors try to clarify the concept of the caliph and show the teachings of Islam that are environmentally friendly through the thought of Seyyed Hossein Nasr. Philosophy and environmental ethics of Nasr have two major projects, namely the resacralization of nature and the clarification of the concept of the caliph through Insan Kamil. For Nasr, man has the ability to control nature, and therefore he must increase his spirituality in the light of monotheism to understand nature holistically. A holistic understanding of nature opens the awareness that humans and nature have intimate, anthropocosmic relationships in which both share the same archetype. The Islamic environmental ethics approach of Nasr seeks to show that Islamic teachings maintain human and natural values without reducing one of the two. The conclusions in this paper show that Islam is compatible with environmental ethics insofar as the interpretation is aimed at this. Islam teaches respect for nature since the concept of the caliph shows that humans have responsibilities and intimate relationships with their environment.
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INTRODUCTION

One of the main problems in establishing the ethics of the religious environment is, first of all, to justify that the theological worldview of religion teaches humans to respect other creatures besides themselves. The difficulty arises because religion has a close connection with the accusation that it is the ringleader of the environmental crisis. Criticism of religion and its relationship to the environmental crisis stems from an article by Lynn White Jr. in 1967. In his writings entitled 'The Historical Roots of Our Ecologic Crisis', he pointed out that Christian theological world-views in the Modern era taught that humans were in a dominant position over nature because they were the image of God and thus anthropocentrism emerged (White, 1967: 797)
Lynn White's criticism, which actually only focuses on Christian theology, has an impact on other Semitic religions, though. This happens because the world-view is similar to the Semitic religion view about the position of humans in the world and its relation to nature and God (Afzaal, 2012: 240). Islamic environmental ethics, consciously or not, is one of the responses of the Semitic religious tradition to Lynn White's criticism. However, writing on Islamic environmental ethics often goes directly into the discussion of Islamic teachings that are relevant to environmental ethics. The thinkers in it often forget the question of how Islam, which teaches humans as caliphs and has a special position in the world, can be compatible with environmental ethics in general. Environmental ethics is generally described as a resistance to anthropocentrism and thus sees nature not only in the light of its instrumental value, but its intrinsic value. Ironically, although the Islamic environmental ethic considers Islam to be an environmentally friendly religion, a country with a Muslim majority does not represent an ethical life before nature (Yildirim, 2012).

Although research on the compatibility of Islamic teachings as teachings on environmental ethics is rarely discussed, at least Erhun Kula (2014) has conducted research on this matter. In his research, he concluded that the teachings of Islam are anthropocentric teachings that respect nature. The conclusion from Kula has problems since its inception, because the caliph is a more complex concept, when juxtaposed with the term anthropocentrism which is insufficient to represent the relationship between humans and nature. Furthermore, the conclusion given by Kula seems absurd, because the teachings which are conceived as anthropocentrism are the main enemies of environmental ethics, paralleled with respect for nature. This paper seeks to transcend the difficulties faced by Kula through the thought of Seyyed Hossein Nasr regarding human relations and nature coupled with the anthropocosmic concept as expressed by Sam Mickey (2007). The anthropocosmic category described by Mickey is needed to understand the relationship between humans and nature in the teachings of Islam so as not to get caught up in the anthropocentric and nonanthropocentric dichotomy.

This paper examines the compatibility of Islam with environmental ethics through the thoughts of Seyyed Hossein Nasr. Nasr's environmental philosophy is inseparable from his efforts to resacralize nature from the secular and mechanistic scientific world-view, and thus nature gains intrinsic value. The strategy pursued by Nasr is to put metaphysical principles back into our investigation of nature. Thus, we can understand nature holistically, so that we can act appropriately with it. The characteristics of metaphysical knowledge also keep us from forgetting the hierarchy of being, where humans and nature relate in a microcosm and macrocosm relation. In reflecting on the relation between humans and nature, the authors will see how Islam, which places humans in special positions as a caliph, does not fall into anthropocentrism. Nasr's ideas about the relationship between humans and nature will be supplemented by an anthropocosmic understanding as expressed by Sam Mickey, that humans have close links with nature. Thus, the environmental ethics approach should not focus on one thing and set aside another.

The method used in this paper is alternative explanations and critical reflection. Alternative explanations are an attempt to find the best explanation through alternative investigations available (Baggini and Fosl, 2012: 72). This method is used to answer whether Islam and the Caliph's teachings are compatible with environmental ethics. As for through critical reflection, the authors seek to see the ethical issues of the Islamic environment in Nasr's thinking, which although it can
show that Islam is relevant to environmental ethics, it still fails to demonstrate how the Islamic approach can achieve ethical life goals with nature.

This paper is divided into four parts. The first part discusses Lynn White's criticism of religion in the context of an environmental crisis. This section also contains criticism of White by pointing out that the interpretation of religious teachings must be understood in the context of space-time and the contribution of religion in solving environmental crises. The second part contains Nasr's philosophical thoughts regarding the relationship of religion in environmental crises and the relationship between humans and nature. Nasr stated that metaphysical thinking in religious traditions is needed so that we can understand nature holistically. Thus we can act before nature. Furthermore, the relationship between humans and nature is seen in a cosmological understanding where humans as microcosms and nature as macrocosms. The third part contains the debate whether Islam promotes anthropocentrism. This needs to be discussed, because the concept of the caliph is a complex concept, namely Islam positions humans as central, but the teachings do not forget the responsibility of humans towards their environment. The fourth part is filled with the authors’ reflection on Islamic environmental ethics in Nasr's thinking. Although Nasr succeeded in proving that Islam is compatible with environmental ethics, he failed in demonstrating how an Islamic environmental ethics approach can achieve the goal of living ethically with nature.

The conclusion of this paper shows that: 1) Islam is compatible with environmental ethics insofar as the interpretation of its teachings is directed towards this matter; and 2) Islam teaches respect for nature since the concept of the caliph shows that humans have responsibilities and intimate relationships with their environment.

RELIGION AND ANTHROPOCENTRICITY

The relationship between religious and environmental studies stems from the investigation of Lynn White Jr. concerning the historical roots of the current environmental crisis. In his writings, he accused Christianity as the culprit of the emergence of anthropocentrism. There are at least three important points in White's analysis of Christian contributions in the environmental crisis. First, Christianity teaches that humans are the only creatures who are in the image of God and thus humans have a dualistic position towards nature. Second, humans have the mandate to control and dominate nature since humans are God's image. As for the third point, concluding the two previous theses, Christian theology has an anthropocentric tendency, in which humans have more important values than other creatures (White, 1967: 1205).

The criticism given by White, although focused on Christianity, in fact had an impact on other semitic religions that had a similar theological worldview. As stated by Kaveh Afrasiabi (1995), the emergence of ecological awareness in the 1960s gave rise to criticism of Islam. This criticism is inseparable from the problem of Islam which, like other monotheistic religions, places humans in a special position in the concept of the caliph. Therefore, for this group, every ecotological effort must go beyond monotheistic religious traditions and seek answers within religious traditions and other alternative belief systems (Afrasiabi, 1995: 281).

Even so, the authors consider that religion still has an important place in dealing with environmental crises. First, the theological worldview of religion is diverse. As stated by Ahmed
Afzaal (2012), theological worldview is in the context of space and time. Thus, the interpretation of religious teachings is not in a historical vacuum (Afzaal, 2012: 242). White himself was aware of this, where he criticized Christian theology specifically only in the Modern era. We can see that the analysis that underlies his criticism of Christian theology is inseparable from religious agitation with philosophy and science at that time. The loss of intrinsic value and respect for nature is a result of the development of Modern philosophy and science that empties the spiritual aspect of explaining how the world works. And at the end of the 18th century, God's hypothesis becomes unnecessary for many scientists (White, 1967: 1206).

As for Afzaal, in an effort to respond to White, using Weberian's analysis of rationalization in the Modern era to clarify and sharpen that what White criticizes is a theological worldview that divorces humans from nature. The theological worldview criticized by White, according to Afzaal, is relevant to supernatural theism which places God in a separate and transcendent position from nature (Afzaal, 2012: 248). Since humans are the image of God, and God is separate from nature, humans also have a dualistic position towards nature. This type of theological worldview dominates the Modern era where practical, theoretical and formal rationality overrides substantive rationality (Afzaal, 2012: 251-252). Science, as a champion of theoretical rationality, allows humans to control their environment through empirical investigations towards abstract concepts. Calculable worlds are a necessity in Modern science since the assumption of materialism in their bodies which assumes that the world contains only fixed matter and its movements can be predicted. The dominance of scientists in organizing and describing the world, as well as the assumption of materialism that empties the spiritual aspect of assuming reality, causes humans to lose intrinsic value, meaning, purpose, and mysterious aspects of nature.

The solution provided by Afzaal is to show that there is a diversity of theological worldviews within a religious tradition (Afzaal, 2012: 253). In his writings, he raised Muhammad Iqbal's thinking as an Islamic thinker who did not fall into the worldview of supernatural theology, but panenteism. Panenteistic theology itself describes God's relationship to the world transcendently and immanently, and thus nature has its intrinsic status. It is interesting to see that actually White also provided a solution similar to what was provided by Afzaal. At the end of his article, White gives an example of a 13th-century Christian figure, Saint Francis of Assisi, who has a theological view that is in harmony with nature. His views on nature and humans, White's comment on the theology understood by St. Francis, rested on a unique pan-psychism of everything that lived and died, designed for the glorification of their transcendent Creator (White, 1967: 1207).

Thus, we do not need to totally negate the religion that we think of as monotheists and then seek answers in other religious traditions and belief systems. This has been the case since the theological worldview of a religion is diverse. The religion that we assume essentially supports anthropocentrism has a differentiation of theological views in its own body that has not yet been discovered and developed to deal with environmental crises. This is only a matter of interpretation.

The next issue that needs to be addressed in the relationship of religious studies and environmental crises is the urgency of the role of religion in it. Why is religious narrative needed as an approach to environmental ethics? Religion, or other belief systems, are needed to patch up the intrinsic value vacuum in understanding the reality left behind by science. Environmental ethics that is not based on metaphysics and theology will always lack intrinsic value and will never
be prescriptive (Synder, 2017: 60). This is because the ethics of the analytical and materialistic environment discriminates against approaches that are limited to material aspects that can be captured empirically from reality, where the mode of intuitive knowledge is never considered valid. The lack of intrinsic value in nature can be read as a consequence of the victory of the scientific worldview in the Modern era. The scientific worldview in question is a worldview that is based solely on ideas that can be tested by empirical observation, according to the highest level of objectivity but limited in utility (Orr, 2006: 437). The limitations of the scientific worldview are caused by two things; first, many ideas that can be falsified cannot be tested until the impact has been felt, and, secondly, the limited scope of knowledge, where ethics which mostly contain ideas that cannot be falsified, such as intrinsic value, are not contained in it (Orr, 2006: 438).

They also have difficulty in determining the prescriptive actions required since the tradition of analytic thought separates explicitly between the descriptive and the prescriptive (Synder, 2017: 64). This is since the scientific world-view assumes reality works naturally, where the world is framed in a conception that each property in it is related to one another in a causal matrix (Brown, 2003: 3). This framing causes a moral crisis, where moral issues as subjective preferences are ruled out in scientific discourse that prioritizes rationality and objectivity. Thus, it can be said that the scientific world-view makes moral philosophy impossible, where the Good is separated from the Real (Brown, 2003: 3).

**SEYYED HOSSEIN NASR: RESACRALIZATION OF NATURE AND INSAN KAMIL**

Seyyed Hossein Nasr was one of the earliest philosophers who linked environmental ethics to Islam. His thoughts can be summarized in two main points, namely the recralization of nature and the conception of Universal Man (Insan Kamil). Resacralization (resacralization) of nature means an effort to restore understanding of the sacred nature, as the meaning is inversely proportional to desacralization. Nasr's attempt to restore the sanctity of nature led him to confront the historical narrative of science.

According to Nasr, the history of science narrates itself unfairly, where success is more often echoed than failure (Nasr, 1968: 18). Science allows humans to control nature and bring up technology to help human work. However, the dominance of science in fact has a bad side where humans ultimately forget the intrinsic and spiritual value of nature, and as such it is only dead matter to fulfill human satisfaction. Therefore, Nasr's first strategy in the effort to resacralize was to examine the intellectual and historical causes of the desacralization that humans carried on nature (Nasr, 1968: 51). The solution provided by Nasr is to revive metaphysics related to nature into the narrative of science.

“…although science is legitimate in it’s self, the role and function of science and it’s application of science have become illegitimate and even dangerous because of the lack of a higher form of knowledge into which science could be integrated and the destruction of the sacred and spiritual value of nature. To remedy this situation the metaphysical knowledge pertaining to nature must be revived and the sacred quality of nature given back to it once again” (Nasr, 1968: 14).
Human forgetfulness of the intrinsic and sacred values of nature, according to Nasr, is caused by the death of cosmology in science itself. Cosmology is defined as the science that deals with all formal order of reality, of which the material order is only one aspect (Nasr, 1968: 22). It is through cosmology that the understanding of reality is not only based on its material aspects: reality is strived to be understood as a whole where the spiritual aspects coexist with the material aspects. Nasr explained the death of cosmology as a consequence of the neglect of metaphysics and forgetfulness of the hierarchy of being in the Modern era (Nasr, 1968: 23). This is caused by the dominance of the scientific worldview through the method of science which reduces reality to pure quantity and can only be understood mathematically (Nasr, 1968: 69). The symbolic understanding of reality changes to naturalism, resulting in the sacred dimension of nature being divorced from the profane. Furthermore, the loss of the transcendent dimension, as well as the suspicion of the inability of humans to understand the knowledge of the essence of something in the Enlightenment era, impacted on ethics, resulting in the truth being reduced to the extent of utility (Nasr, 1968: 71).

The solution offered by Nasr is to integrate science with metaphysical principles about nature. The metaphysics referred to by Nasr is a reality theory whose realization means purity and spiritual perfection, and as such can only be achieved within the cadre of revealed traditions (Nasr, 1968: 81). Through the metaphysical principles in the revelation tradition, knowledge about nature is inseparable from the moral and spiritual aspects. In *Man and Nature*, Nasr has given a number of examples of metaphysical principles about nature in various religious traditions, ranging from Taoism to Christianity. However, due to limited space and topic of discussion, this paper will only focus on Nasr's efforts to rebuild metaphysics in the tradition of Islamic thought.

Efforts to reawaken metaphysics in the Islamic tradition as a supplement to science are closely related to the interpretation of the concept of monotheism. This is a metaphysical concept that integrates all modes of knowledge and being in the horizon of Islamic thought (Nasr, 1968: 94). Monotheism is a declaration of world unity uttered by a Muslim in the first sentence of the shahada: "There is no God but Allah". According to Nasr, God is both transcendent and immanent towards the world (Nasr, 2007: 43). Nasr, creatively reminded the understanding of the wise people in the Islamic tradition of the past that the 'verse' (sign) is not just a sentence that is commonly read by Muslims in the Quran. He explained that there were two understandings of the 'verse': the written and the cosmic (Nasr, 1968: 95). The written verses are signs of Allah's greatness recorded in the Quran. The cosmic verse is the universe which is referred to by the Quran itself. It is through this understanding that nature is depicted as a veil of *teophany*, where God shows his power.

Recalibration through Islamic metaphysics, for Nasr, can only be achieved when one fully understands the significance of the unity of the world in the light of monotheism (Nasr, 1998: 121). The Quran teaches that Allah is all-pervasive. "And Allah belongs to what is in the heavens and what is on earth, and (knowledge) Allah encompasses everything" (An-Nisa: 26). The meaning of one of the names of Allah shows that all creation has a spiritual basis, namely God. Therefore, humans must appreciate and respect all creation because all creation contains intrinsic value. Creation is thus sacred, and damaging it means tarnishing that sacredness.

For Nasr, the environmental crisis is a crisis of spirituality (Nasr, 1998: 121). Man's excitement before nature is the result of human forgetfulness and rejection of the existence of God which includes the entire environment in which he is. Understanding of the unity of this world,
according to Nasr, will die when we try to understand reality based only on science. This is because the scientific approach to understanding reality has a method limit where they only accept empirical experience and mathematical calculations in understanding nature. The limitation of the method, in fact, has an influence on ontological assumptions in science where current reality is independent of other realities. Thus, the important question is what kind of epistemology enables humans to comprehend reality holistically?

The way out given by Nasr regarding this difficulty is intuition or mystical experience as pursued by mystics in the Islamic tradition (Nasr, 2007: 76). Nasr explained that there are various testimonies in the tradition of Islamic mysticism regarding experiences of other realities made possible only through intuition. Muslim thinkers and mystics love nature with such intensity because they have been able to hear the prayers of all beings in the natural world to God" (Nasr, 1998: 122). The Quran itself says that there is not one thing that does not glorify Allah. "The seven heavens, the earth and all that is in it glorify God. And there is nothing but glorifying by praising Him, but you do not understand their prayer beads. Truly, He is Most Merciful, Most Forgiving. "(Al-Isra: 44).

Human failure to understand other realities is caused by the separation of the role of reason from the intellect (Nasr, 2007: 67). According to Nasr, we must analyze the meaning and role of reason and intellect, where humans strive to control the world. Intellect is explained as a faculty that knows firsthand and total, while reason (ratio) plays a role in analysis and division. It is through intellect that humans can understand the unity of the world, where its manifestations are revelations in the form of intuition or religious experience. As for reason, Nasr explained is the shadow and reflection of the intellect" (Nasr, 2007: 68). Nasr considers that reason can be a positive instrument for us to control nature as long as it is integrated with intellect and revelation. The problem then is that this principle, for Nasr, is forgotten by the Modern people, where reason is divorced from intellect and revelation so as to cause disharmony.

“If modern man has been able to dominate but at the same time destroy nature and himself more than man of all other civilizations, it is precisely because with him more than ever before reason has been made independent of its principle”" (Nasr, 2007: 68).

Although intuition can be a way out of how we can understand the intrinsic value of nature, he considers that awareness is only obtained by people who have reached perfection of their potential as human beings (Nasr, 1998: 123). Nasr discussed a lot about the figure of Universal Man or Insan Kamil in his thoughts. Insan Kamil meant by Nasr is a person who has realized his full potential as a human being (Nasr, 2007: 66). This is a classic conception of human philosophy in the tradition of Islamic mysticism in which Insan Kamil is a person who has gained the quality of God's names through his efforts. The figures considered to be examples of Insan Kamil are the Prophet Muhammad, and a number of mystics such as Ibn Arabi and Rumi. To explain the relationship between humans and nature in the human conceptions he made, Nasr said:

“The universal Man contains all degrees of existence within himself and is the archetype of both the cosmos and man. Therefore, metaphysically
Nasr’s human conception, therefore, wants to show that man and nature in Islamic teachings are not in a dualistic and separate position. Instead, Nasr analogizes the relationship between humans and nature cosmologically where humans are microcosms, and nature is macrocosms. The relationship between the two cannot be separated. Microcosm requires macrocosm as a forum for its presence to learn to be human. On the other hand, there is no reason for a macrocosm to be present if it is not to present a microcosm (Nasr, 2007: 65).

In the light of the Insan Kamil, Nasr also sought to clarify the concept of the caliph which was often mistakenly interpreted unilaterally as an anthropocentric idea. According to Nasr, the caliph contains two qualities that are equal to each other (Nasr, 1998: 124). First, the caliph teaches that humans are God's representatives on earth. In their efforts as God's representatives, humans need to be active to maintain cosmic harmony. Although Islam teaches that humans have a special position, but that does not mean that humans occupy a central position than other creatures. That is because man as a caliph is a servant of Allah and as such must obey his commands. This second characteristic shows that humans must be passive to God and receptive to the gifts that He gives.

**KHALIFAH AS ANTHROPOCOSM**

The Caliph is a controversial concept in the ethics of Islamic environment. We can say that the concept of the caliph, at first sight, is similar to the concept of the image of God that was criticized by White. This has at least been realized by Islamic environmental ethics thinkers. Afrasiabi, for example, revealed that what was criticized in Islamic theology was the assumption that other creations were only tools for humans to carry out their role as representatives of God on earth (caliph) (Afrasiabi, 2003: 281). Furthermore, as further analyzed by Afrasiabi, this criticism has its root problem in ontology where Islam teaches that humans and nature have theological dualism in seeing humans and nature as two separate things. Thus, the teachings of Islam as a whole are considered to teach mere utilitarianism. In addition to providing an analysis of criticism of Islamic theology, Afrasiabi also criticized Nasr regarding human relations and nature, where according to him Nasr was still trapped in anthropocentric thinking that the final cause of nature was only for human use (Afrasiabi, 2003: 283).

This section will examine, in general, whether such criticism is appropriately given against Islam. Specifically, the author will also investigate whether Afrasiabi’s criticism is appropriately addressed to Nasr. Through these two cases, the author focuses the problem on the concept of the caliph. Only when the concept of the caliph is fully understood in relation to nature, Islam has the justification for discussing environmental ethics. The problem is, the caliph is a complicated concept, and some people only understand it partially.

Following what Afrasiabi explained, the concept of the caliph had his first problem with regard to man's special position in the world. Humans are considered to have a higher position than nature, where nature is merely a tool to be used by humans. Therefore, this teaching is considered to have dualistic assumptions in seeing nature and humans. The question then is: is that right?
As Nasr explained, the whole system of epistemology and ontology in Islam is bound by the concept of monotheism (tawḥīd). Monotheism (tawḥīd) itself is a term that is difficult to find an equivalent word because it explains the conditions of the world while also implying action. Thus, there is no integration process without an understanding of the conditions of unity. The next issue is how can we understand the condition of the unity?

Understanding the condition of unity is not possible through mere reason or ratio. The faculty deals only with how we analyze reality, breaking the whole into parts. Nasr considers that unity can only be understood through intellect. Through this faculty, humans understand diversity in unity. The manifestation of the intellect is an understanding gained in religious intuition or experience. In the Islamic tradition, we know the Sufi group as a group that seeks to understand the unity of the world and the significance of the teachings of monotheism. However, ways to understand the unity of the world are varied. Nasr reminded that the Prophet Muhammad once said, "the number of ways to God is equal to the number of children of Adam" (Nasr, 2007: 76). Nasr interpreted these words and assumed that the Prophet Muhammad was showing that there were a number of ways in a number of settings for us to meet God. Meeting with God itself brings us to a feeling of cosmic unity. As for this we can find in a number of different religious traditions in different times and spaces.

Through the concept of Insan Kamil in the tradition of Islamic thought, Nasr actually wanted to show that Islam never taught dualism in looking at humans and nature. Through this concept, humans share the same archetypes with nature and as such both have an intimate connection. Although outwardly a small part of the cosmos, Nasr said clearly that, human beings contain within themselves and within themselves a reality which is the source of the cosmos itself (Nasr, 2007: 65). Nasr described the close relationship between humans and nature as microcosm and macrocosm. Although he considers that the macrocosm is present to bring up the microcosm, this does not necessarily indicate that he is trapped in anthropocentricity, where nature only ends up as a means of satisfying humans. Nasr explained that humans as caliph were not only given the task of controlling nature, but also controlling themselves.

Thus, the Afrasiabi criticism which sued Nasr falling into utilitarianism and anthropocentrism is incorrect. Although Nasr said that the final cause of nature is its use for humans, it has a condition that man has a spiritual virtue whose decision is not only for himself, but also for all creation (Nasr, 1981: 132). The Qur'an itself teaches that man must be fair and suppress his desires.

(Allah said)," O Dawud! Verily, thou hast made a khalifah (ruler) on earth, then give a ruling (matter) among men with justice and do not follow the passions, because it will lead you astray from the way of Allah.” (Sad: 26)

The position of humans as God's representatives on earth is not an immediate status. The human position implies human responsibility for the condition of the environment in which he is located. Islam, therefore, does not separate what is real from ideal. For being the caliph of Allah on earth and occupying the central position he holds, Nasr said, that humans are a channel of grace for nature. Spiritual man is a means by which nature breathes spiritually and is prevented from death and destruction (Nasr, 2007: 67). Why human is responsible for nature because Islam does
not limit the concept of community limited to humans, but also other creations besides humans.

(Allah said), "And there is not an animal on the earth or birds that fly with both wings, but all are people (also) like you. There is nothing that we escape in the Book, then to God they are gathered." (Al-An'am: 38).

Of course, it is a haste to assume that Islam is an anthropocentric teaching, since the Quran clearly states that other creations are also people like humans. We must reflect back on Aldo Leopold's thought, one of the earliest ecological figures on how to get non-human beings to obtain ethical status by calculating it as a community (Leopold, 1949).

Thus, the environmental ethics initiated by Nasr not only returns the intrinsic and sacred value of nature, but also reflects back the existential existence of humans in the world. Then, in what groups is Nasr's thinking categorized in the environmental ethics approach? Is Nasr an anthropocentric because he still emphasizes the central position of humans in regulating nature? Or, he is a nonanthropocentric because his philosophical effort is to restore the sanctity of nature before humans and thus the value of nature is not merely of its usefulness? Anthropocentrism and nonanthropocentrism, unfortunately, are not satisfactory in explaining Nasr's thinking, specifically, and also the teachings of Islam, in general. This is because humans and nature have values that cannot be reduced or ruled out. Unfortunately, Nasr, in his efforts to read Islamic teachings alternatively, did not label his own thoughts, and thus commentators of his thoughts were trapped in these two general categories. The authors want to show that the type of approach given by Nasr is anthropocosmic.

Genealogy of the term anthropocosm can be traced to a number of Mircea Eliade's works from the 1940s to the 1970s (Mickey, 2007: 229). Through a number of his works, Eliade, through the method of phenomenology of religion, saw that there was a worldview in a number of religions that saw an intimate relationship between humans and nature. In Patterns in Comparative Religion, for example, Eliade said that religious experience enables humans to experience anthropocosmic experiences, where humans feel their openness to the cosmos((Eliade, 1958: 455).

Through Eliade's anthropocosmic concept, Sam Mickey (2007) seeks to transcend anthropocentrism and nonanthropocentrism. Anthropocosmic vision shows that humans and nature are no longer seen as two things that are exclusive to each other (Mickey, 2007: 231). In other words, this vision sees that there is a union between humans and nature, both of which are homologous. The anthropocosmic archetype is what allows humans to experience unity with nature (Mickey, 2007: 231). The description of anthropocosmic symbolism, in addition to increasing our understanding of the history of religion, can encourage deep involvement between humans and the world (Mickey, 2007: 233). This is what makes the anthropocosmic vision relevant to the discourse on environmental ethics. According to Mickey, the anthropocosmic vision can transcend the anthropocentrism and non-anthropocentrism debate, since humans and nature are no longer seen as exclusive, independent of each other. Understanding that humans and nature are one entity means rejecting any type of approach that excludes one of them. This is because, on the one hand, anthropocentric reduces the value of nature only as a utility, and on the other hand, nonanthropocentric has a misanthropic tendency in its efforts to reduce human values.

Mickey's efforts in his writing are to see the implications of the anthropocosmic vision in
environmental ethics. For him, since the anthropocosmic vision views humans and nature as one entity, the anthropocosmic approach does not fall into a certain central value principle. He said that, the anthropocosmic approach to environmental ethics does not place the sort of center of universal values that might be found in anthropocentric, biosentric, or ecocentric ethics. Human values do not conflict with world values as mutually exclusive; on the contrary, the two are closely interrelated and implicate each other, so that any valuable value or whatever - both human and non-human - can have a very important impact on humans and non-humans (Mickey, 2007: 243-244).

Because the anthropocosmic approach does not determine a certain value principle, this approach is considered too vague and ambiguous. However, Mickey sees that the absence of a central value in the anthropocosmic approach actually provides advantages over the approach compared to other approaches, namely by adaptation and adjustment (Mickey, 2007: 244). With adaptation and adjustment means this approach does not focus on one thing that is universally imperative and contrasts it with particular decisions. For him, particular decisions and universal imperatives are two things that should co-exist with each other, and as such there are no subordinates (Mickey, 2007: 242). Mickey sees that the solution to this anthropocosmic approach can be traced from the anthropocosmic worldview of various religions. According to Mickey, with their various contributions to the anthropocosmic approach to ethics, both Confucianism, Daoism, Islam, and Hinduism do not place a dichotomy between concrete decisions and universal laws or the necessity that must be applied to those decisions. On the contrary, certain decisions and universal imperatives are mutually replacing, in such a way that the particular and universal participate in one another, not the one lower than the other (Mickey, 2007: 242).

Through this anthropocosmic approach, Nasr's ideas should be categorized. Nasr's attempt to explain humans as God's representatives on earth, as written in the Quran, does not mean that he is trapped in anthropocentrism. Likewise, it is with Islam. Although Islam teaches that humans have a central position on earth, that status is not value-free. Humans have a big task in maintaining harmony and preventing disharmony. Nasr's attempt to show man's central position must be understood in the light that human actions have a great significance to nature. Therefore, humans need to rebuild and enhance their spirituality so that their ability to control nature is not built by unjustified desires.

TWO APPROACHES TO THE ETHICS OF THE ISLAMIC ENVIRONMENT AND THE GAP BETWEEN THE TWO

Nasr's thoughts, however, have not been able to answer the gaps and challenges in the ethical approach to the Islamic environment. At least, there are two approaches to Islamic environmental ethics: cosmology and fiqh (Jenkins, 2005: 338). Although both share the same metaphysical doctrine, they differ radically in accepted epistemology (Chittick, 2001: 60). The cosmological approach, like that of Nasr, prioritizes the intellect to understand reality as a whole. Although Nasr considers that ontology and ethics are related, we can find that the cosmological approach lacks conclusive answers about how we should act before nature. The fiqh approach emphasizes the process of knowledge through the transmission of the tradition of Islamic teachings. This approach focuses on determining what practical actions need to be taken based on
the understanding provided in the tradition of Islamic teachings.

Even though Islamic environmental ethics has started to be widely discussed, we can assume that Islamic environmental ethics has not met its objectives. Most Muslim-majority countries still do not care about the issue of the environmental crisis (Yildirim, 2012). According to Nasr, this is because Muslims do not understand essential Islam, where most of the factors are the dominance of Western civilization in the Muslim world (Nasr, 1998: 118). Although external factors have an influence on the condition of a society, we need to be critical in the system of thought created in our own society to check whether it works or not.

The right criticism aimed at Nasr is that glorification of past Islam will never be enough to overcome the challenges of the present. Richard Foltz, for example, considers that what needs to be done by Islamic thinkers today is to make universal agreements based on the Quran and Hadith in articulating an environmentally friendly and non-hierarchical understanding (Foltz, 2000: 64). In line with Foltz, Willis Jenkins considers that the cosmological approach lacks discussion of what practical actions need to be taken. As for Abu Sway, one of the earliest figures who discussed environmental jurisprudence, considered that the cosmological-philosophical approach was not so close to Muslim societies (Sway, 1998).

Nasr himself considers that *fiqh* is needed in building Islamic environmental ethics (Nasr, 1998: 135). The problem is, both approaches have gaps that cannot be bridged by Islamic environmental ethical thinkers. Nasr himself did not demonstrate how to bridge the gap between the two. The loophole questions how cosmological thinking can be integrated into *fiqh*. Cosmological thinking, although it can provide a complete understanding of reality, has an exclusive tendency that not everyone can do. As for Jurisprudence itself, whose epistemology is tied to tradition, has a tendency to be old-fashioned. Thinkers from both approaches also have a tendency to negate each other. William Chittick, for example, considers that *fiqh* failed to provide space for subjects to understand monotheism personally (Chittick, 2001: 67-68). The Jenkins assume that cosmology can never be prescriptive because it only dwells on the problem of interpretation (Jenkins, 2005: 340). Therefore, the fundamental problem that is actually faced by Islamic environmental ethics today is how to bridge the cosmological and *fiqh* approach, and thus our understanding is not only a dead vision.

**CONCLUSION**

The conclusion of this paper shows that, first of all, Islam is compatible with environmental ethics insofar as the interpretation of its teachings is aimed at this. Through the discussion in the previous section, we saw that theological worldviews must be understood in the context of space and time. Thus, the notion that Islam essentially teaches anthropocentrism cannot be justified. Revelation itself is still ongoing and its manifestation is a human effort to face new problems through reflection on religious teachings.

Second, Islam teaches respect for nature since the concept of the caliph shows that humans have responsibilities and intimate relationships with their environment. The main criticism for the ethics of Islamic environment is that Islam teaches anthropocentrism in the form of the caliph concept. Through Seyyed Hossein Nasr, humans do indeed occupy a special position among other creatures, but that position is not a position that is free of value and without responsibility. Humans
need to improve their spirituality to understand other realities so that their control is not based on an unjustified desire from a partial understanding of the world of nature.
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