

1991

Earth or Consequences? Mythologizing the Earth Entity as a Way to Environmental Awareness

Ella A. Kwisnek

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dsc.duq.edu/dlr>



Part of the [Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Ella A. Kwisnek, *Earth or Consequences? Mythologizing the Earth Entity as a Way to Environmental Awareness*, 29 Duq. L. Rev. 733 (1991).

Available at: <https://dsc.duq.edu/dlr/vol29/iss4/5>

This Comment is brought to you for free and open access by Duquesne Scholarship Collection. It has been accepted for inclusion in Duquesne Law Review by an authorized editor of Duquesne Scholarship Collection.

Comments

Earth or Consequences? Mythologizing the Earth Entity as a Way to Environmental Awareness

I. THE PATH TO ECOMORALITY

Mythology is the song. It is the song of the imagination inspired by the energies of the body. Once a Zen master stood up before his students and was about to deliver a sermon. And just as he was about to open his mouth, a bird sang. And he said, "The sermon has been delivered."

A plethora of laws now exists to protect our natural environment.² As A. Dan Tarlock pointed out in his article "*Earth and Other Ethics: The Institutional Issues*," however: "Complex as our current environmental laws are, they represent an incomplete response to the moral and scientific lessons of ecology."³ Tarlock cited two reasons for this failure to develop "an operational theory of environmentalism" (what I will call ecophilosophy):

1. a continued reliance on technology
2. a belief that the basic theoretical justifications for environmental regulations are in place.⁴

Clearly, our technology is inadequate and the regulations in place are not achieving their aim. Denis Hayes, the "father of Earth Day," stated in a recent interview: "If you're looking at global warming, ozone destruction, ocean pollution, spread of radioactive waste, toxic substances, the ecological undermining of world food systems, the size of the global population, the rate at which species

1. Joseph Campbell with Bill Moyers, *The Power of Myth* 22 (Doubleday, 1988).
2. See A. Dan Tarlock, *Earth and Other Ethics: The Institutional Issues*, 56 Tenn L Rev 43, 44 n.2 (1988).
3. Tarlock, 56 Tenn L Rev at 44 (cited in note 2).
4. Id at 45.

are going extinct—in each of these we are in worse shape than we were 20 years ago.”⁵ Additionally, Thomas Berry, in his book *The Dream of the Earth*, noted that “we have changed the very chemistry of the planet, we have altered the biosystems, we have changed the topography and even the geological structure of the planet, structures and functions that have taken hundreds of millions and even billions of years to bring into existence.”⁶ Tarlock is by no means alone among legal scholars in making the assertion that “[m]any of our laws rest on insufficiently articulated scientific and ethical foundations.”⁷

Indeed, Tarlock's piece was written in response to Professor Christopher Stone's work "*Earth and Other Ethics: The Case for Moral Pluralism*."⁸ In this publication, Stone continued the argument he first proposed in "*Should Trees Have Standing*"—nonhuman entities have interests which should be protected.⁹ In this subsequent article, however, Stone went much further than in the first. Stone stated, as Tarlock's comments indicate, that our traditional legal and moral views are inadequate to support the many environmental regulations now in place.¹⁰ Stone questioned what he terms the conventional approach to ethics, which is to develop a single coherent body of principles.¹¹ Moreover, Stone asserted that, by partitioning moral activities into several units he terms planes, each with its own principles and logical approaches, we can better determine which entities deserve consideration in our societal structures.¹² Regarding the extension of legal rights to nonhuman entities, Stone stated: "Through legal fiction, you may be able to make your [nonhuman entity] legally considerate; but there is no moral legerdemain through which you can make them morally considerate."¹³

The dilemma this article addresses is the promulgation of environmental laws that have no philosophical basis in our society's

5. Vicki Quade, Barrister interview with Denis Hayes, *20 Years of Saving the Earth*, 17 Barrister 16, 18 (Fall 1990).

6. Thomas Berry, *The Dream of the Earth* xiii (Sierra Club Books, 1990).

7. Tarlock, *Earth and Other Ethics*, 56 Tenn L Rev at 46 (cited in note 2).

8. See Christopher D. Stone, *Should Trees Have Standing? Revisited: How Far Will Law and Morals Reach? A Pluralist Perspective*, 59 S Cal L Rev 1 (1985).

9. Christopher D. Stone, *Should Trees Have Standing? Toward Legal Rights for Natural Objects*, 45 S Cal L Rev 450 (1972).

10. Stone, 59 S Cal L Rev at 9 (cited in note 8).

11. Id. Stone terms this approach Moral Monism. Id.

12. Id. This is what Stone terms Moral Pluralism. Id.

13. Id at 44. This quote contains many terms specific to Stone's theory.

mores.¹⁴ Through his writings, Stone has suggested moral pluralism; he concedes that this is only one proposal and so welcomes others.

In proposing an alternative by which to form this moral or philosophical basis, I will proceed with a basic assumption regarding which view of nature is most desirable. In my estimation, the best way to give meaning to our environmental laws is by creating a respect for nature.¹⁵ Rather than seeing humans as dominators of nature, this view sees us as brothers therewith. Much like many Eastern philosophies, much like various American Indian beliefs, this is the notion that humans are only one part of a whole, the whole which comprises our planet Earth.¹⁶ Nevertheless, we humans have a unique position due to our ability to control and destroy so many of nature's inhabitants. As Roderick Frazier Nash remarked: "Human beings are the moral agents who have the responsibility to articulate and defend the rights of the other occupants of the planet."¹⁷

Such a conception of rights means that humans have duties or obligations toward nature. "Environmental ethics involves people extending ethics to the environment by the exercise of self-restraint."¹⁸ The entire question, then, is how to get people to exercise this self-restraint. In quoting Aldo Leopold, Nash has argued that these self-imposed limitations or ethics will develop from the notion that "the individual is a member of a community of interdependent parts."¹⁹ Another author has suggested that this respect

14. See Christopher D. Stone, *Response and Rejoinder*, 56 Tenn L Rev 231, 235 (1988), wherein the author stated: "We need an environmental rationale and methodology with enough appeal and detail that it can provide some good direction for human conduct." Furthermore, "[n]o environmental legislation, not even the laws on the books right now, can be administered intelligibly or intelligently without an excursus into a deeper environmental ethic than anyone in public office has been prepared to formulate." Stone, 56 Tenn L Rev at 238 (cited in this note).

15. One may designate such a reverence for nature pantheism; yet, Joseph Campbell points out that this is a misleading term since the idea here is not one of a personal god, but rather it is a trans-theological notion. "It is an undefinable, inconceivable mystery, thought of as a power, that is the source and end and supporting ground of all life and being." Joseph Campbell with Bill Moyers, *The Power of Myth* at 31 (cited in note 1).

16. See Sean McDonagh, *To Care for the Earth: A Call to a New Theology* 102 (Caswell Ltd, 1986): To "pretend that we have no organic connection with the rest of creation is to overlook the greater part of 20 billion years of the story of the universe." McDonagh, *To Care for the Earth* at 102 (cited in this note).

17. Roderick Frazier Nash, *The Rights of Nature: A History of Environmental Ethics* 10 (The University of Wisconsin Press, 1989).

18. Nash, *The Rights of Nature* at 10 (cited in note 17).

19. Id at 69 (citing Aldo Leopold, *A Sand County Almanac*, 203-04, 205, 218, 226, vii

need not result in "misplaced sympathy," for "we cannot stop eating, but why have we forgotten how to ask a blessing or give thanks for what we eat?"²⁰ Joseph Campbell pointed out in *The Masks of God* that the ritual religions of some of the earliest hunting societies involved such things as apologizing to animals because they must be killed.²¹

How can we bring about this introduction of morality into the human-nature relationship?²² Such a proposal necessitates "a complete restructuring of basic American priorities and behavior" and "a radical redefinition of progress."²³ William Irwin Thompson noted in *Gaia: A Way of Knowing* that "an ecology of consciousness on a global level is going to require an enlightenment more profound than the philosophical Enlightenment in Europe that inspired the American and French Revolutions."²⁴ Such a transhuman ethical philosophy is antithetical to much in our western tradition. Is Stone's proposal of moral pluralism adequate to bring about such a fundamental change in Western Philosophy? I think not.

Professor Milner S. Ball, in a response to Stone's "*Trees Revisited*," proposed storytelling as a preferred medium to Stone's abstract constructs.²⁵ Ball cited limits to such narrations, yet he queried if we might not benefit from frank discourse about "the stories that shape and guide us."²⁶ Ball also indicated that, in discussing "planes," Stone was not necessarily addressing the underlying

(Oxford University Press, 1949): "We must change our view of seeing land as a commodity to as a community."

20. Stephen Larsen, *The Shaman's Doorway* 163 (Harper & Row, 1976).

21. Joseph Campbell, *The Masks of God: Primitive Mythology* (Viking Press, 1959). Additionally, in James Young's article, *Thomas Berry and a New Creation Story*, 106 *The Christian Century* 750 (1989), Thomas Berry is quoted as saying:

We have lost our sense of courtesy toward the earth and its inhabitants, our sense of gratitude, our willingness to recognize the sacred character of habitat, our capacity for the awesome, for the numinous quality of every earthly reality.

Young, 106 *Christian Century* at 750 (cited in this note).

22. Nash, *The Rights of Nature* at 72 (cited in note 17).

23. Id at 73.

24. William Irwin Thompson, *The Cultural Implications of the New Biology*, in William Irwin Thompson's, ed, *Gaia: A Way of Knowing* 31-2 (The Lindisfarne Press, 1987).

25. Milner S. Ball, *Moral Pluralism, The Tardis, and Rattlesnakes*, 56 *Tenn L Rev* 13, 24 (1988). "An effective account of ecological morality will start not with principles or axioms . . . but with a narrative presentation of the clearest, best-defined paradigmatic cases of acting with the grain of, or contrary to, the ecosystems whose powers bear down on, but also sustain the lives of ALL those living creatures that share, rely on, and enjoy planet Earth." Stephen Toulmin, *The Case for Cosmic Prudence*, 56 *Tenn L Rev*, 29, 40 (1988).

26. Ball, 56 *Tenn L Rev* at 24-5 (cited in note 25).

question.²⁷ Maybe this is so because the underlying question is something which is beyond human comprehension and reason, something with which only a story can get us in touch. But not just any story enables humans to comprehend the incomprehensible, to achieve a oneness with being. Only a myth has this force.²⁸

Therefore, I propose that the vacuum we encounter in environmental law, this need for an ecophilosophy, be filled with a myth or a story. How then do we define myth? A narrow definition may describe myths as "stories about gods."²⁹ On the other hand, "[m]yth can be understood as a particular form in which humans mentally digest and assimilate reality insofar as it makes itself palpable as an overpowering phenomenon, incapable of being dominated or manipulated completely."³⁰ That is, myth provides a path or a way for us to apprehend those things which would be incomprehensible if approached with the use of reason.³¹

Myths deal with primal experiences that all humans encounter such as birth, puberty and death, and while they may reflect local culture, the message is the same. Such a tale is "the expression of man's total response to his encounter with reality and his subsequent effort to secure his own existence meaningfully in the face of that reality."³² Today our society is largely devoid of myths and is suffering for it.³³ The old myths have lost their meaning in a rapidly changing world.³⁴ As Joseph Campbell once observed: "We have to accept the fact that the walls have lately been knocked

27. Id at 25.

28. The notions of myth used herein are derived from the writings and thoughts of Joseph Campbell.

29. John F. Priest, *Myth and Dream in Hebrew Scripture*, in Joseph Campbell's, ed, *Myths, Dreams and Religion* 49 (E.P. Dutton & Co., Inc., 1970).

30. Jacques Waardenburg, *Symbolic Aspects of Myth*, in Alan M. Olson's, ed, *Myth, Symbol and Reality* 58 (University of Notre Dame Press, 1980). While rationalists see myth as a product of ignorance or waywardness, a more benign view of myth has been gaining ground in this century. Waardenburg, in Olson's, ed, *Myth, Symbol and Reality* at 32-3 (cited in this note).

31. "Myths . . . are the purveyors of a wisdom that has borne the race of man through the long vicissitudes of his career." Joseph Campbell, *The Flight of the Wild Gander* 34 (Viking Press, 1969).

32. Priest in Campbell's, ed, *Myths, Dreams and Religion* 52 (cited in note 29).

33. Stanley Romaine Hopper, *Myth, Dream, and Imagination*, in Joseph Campbell's, ed, *Myth, Dream and Religion* 114-15.

34. Joseph Campbell, *Mythological Themes in Creative Literature and Art*, in Joseph Campbell's, ed, *Myths, Dreams and Religion* 144 (cited in note 29). "To be effective, a mythology must be up to date scientifically, based on a concept of the universe that is current, accepted, and convincing." Campbell in Campbell's, ed, *Myths, Dream and Religion* at 114 (cited in note 29).

from around all mythologies—every single one of them—by the findings and works of modern scientific discovery.”³⁵ Joseph Campbell has further pointed out that nature is prime and is “as deep and, finally, inscrutable as Being itself.”³⁶

To get in touch with such a primal entity, we need a myth, a story which creates in us a respect or reverence for life and for the entire community which inhabits the Earth. Campbell himself has realized that the only mythology which would be valid today is that of our planet, of this entire living organism. That myth does not exist.³⁷

According to Campbell, our Biblical tradition does not foster this belief.³⁸ In the Old Testament particularly, nature is something which is to be controlled. This is a very different approach than that of Native Americans, for example, who strive to come in accord with nature. Nature is a vital part of this planet; is it not strange that we are only now coming to realize our brotherhood with all living things?³⁹

One who is in constant or frequent contact with nature understands this dependency. In a culture so reliant upon science as a guide we are blind to that aspect of Darwinism which illuminates our interdependency with all things on this planet—air, water, soil, plants and animals.⁴⁰ Yet, isolated in the concrete of our cities, we do not so readily comprehend this oneness.

As aforementioned, Campbell has suggested that the myth which will have meaning in the future is that of the Earth as an organism. He points out that, from space, our planet has no divisions and that the Earth is a likely symbol of our future myth.⁴¹ How does this notion of creating a myth about our planet resolve the

35. Campbell, *The Flight of the Wild Gander* at 105 (cited in note 31).

36. Id at 111 (cited in note 31). Additionally, in Joseph Campbell, *The Inner Reaches of Outer Space* 18 (St. James Press, 1986), Joseph Campbell stated, “Indeed, the first and most essential service of mythology is this one, of opening the mind and heart to the utter wonder of being. And the second service, then, is cosmological: of representing the universe and whole spectacle of nature, both as known to the mind and as beheld by the eye.”

37. Campbell with Moyers, *The Power of Myth* at 22 (cited in note 1).

38. Id at 23-4.

39. Joseph Campbell says “[w]e have today to learn to get back into accord with the wisdom of nature and realize again our brotherhood with the animals and with the water and the sea”. Id at 31.

40. See J.E. Lovelock, *Gaia: A New Look at Life on Earth* 127-28 (Oxford University Press, 1979): “The Gaian world evolves through Darwinian natural selection, its goal being the maintenance of conditions optimal for life in all circumstances, including variations in output from the sun and from the planet’s own interior.”

41. Campbell with Moyers, *The Power of Myth* at 32-3 (cited in note 1).

problem of our environmental laws lacking an ecophilosophy? One author has pointed out:

Myth is a tremendous tool for legal scholars. It is a key to the cultural imagination out of which legal concepts take shape.⁴²

In the instant case, we have the regulations but not the foundational concepts. A myth treating the planet as an organism will lead to respect for living things. Granted, we cannot expect absolute compliance with environmental laws; but as Aldo Leopold once stated: "In these higher aspirations the important thing is not to achieve, but to strive."⁴³

One cannot merely create a myth. However, Joseph Campbell offers us his encouraging opinion that myth is coming back.⁴⁴ We can only hope that the development of such a myth does indeed occur and that it develops sooner rather than later. Such a myth, with the planet as our symbol, will solve many problems other than our environmental ones. In an age such as ours where reason rules supreme, one should not bristle at the thought of being duped by a lie, for myth should not be viewed as true or untrue, but as "effective or ineffective, maturative or pathogenic."⁴⁵

II. GAIA: A FUSION OF SCIENCE AND STORY

This we know: the earth does not belong to man, man belongs to the earth. All things are connected like the blood that unites us all. Man did not weave the web of life, he is merely a strand in it. Whatever he does to the web he does to himself.⁴⁶

Scholars in other fields have also been propounding our society's need for an earth story to guide us. James Lovelock, in his book *Gaia: A New Look at Life on Earth*, put forth his notion of Gaia.⁴⁷ Lovelock's hypothesis is that "the Earth's living matter, air, oceans and land surface form a complex system which can be seen as a

42. Susan H. Williams, *The Use of Myth: A Response to Professor Bassett*, 4 J L & Relig 153, 159 (1987).

43. Nash, *The Rights of Nature* at 72 (cited in note 17) (quoting Aldo Leopold, *A Sand County Almanac* at 209-10 (cited in note 19)).

44. Campbell with Moyers, *The Power of Myth* at 169 (cited in note 1).

45. Campbell, *Flight of the Wild Gander* at 6 (cited in note 31).

46. Campbell with Moyers, *The Power of Myth* at 34 (cited in note 1) (quoting a phrase spoken by Chief Seattle in 1852).

47. Gaia is the Greek goddess of the earth. Lovelock explains: "I have frequently used the word Gaia as a shorthand for the hypothesis itself, namely that the biosphere is a self-regulating entity with the capacity to keep our planet healthy by controlling the chemical and physical environment." Lovelock, *Gaia* at ix (cited in note 40).

single organism and which has the capacity to keep our planet a fit place for life."⁴⁸ According to this notion, the Earth organism is capable of manipulating its atmosphere to enable its survival; it is an entity with powers greater than any of its constituent parts.⁴⁹

According to Lovelock, Gaia has three principle characteristics which could radically alter humans' relationship with the rest of the biosphere.⁵⁰ Lovelock listed as the most important of these properties Gaia's tendency to optimize conditions for all terrestrial life.⁵¹ Next, Gaia has both vital organisms and expendable ones.⁵² Finally, Gaian responses to change obey the rules of cybernetics.⁵³ Lovelock described the rule of cybernetics as the notion that the "primary function of [such a system] is to steer an optimum course through changing conditions towards a predetermined goal."⁵⁴

In his book, Lovelock pointed out that humans are merely one species comprising Gaia.⁵⁵ However, as our population grows and as our energy output increases, our alienation from Gaia intensifies.⁵⁶

Each time we significantly alter part of some natural process of regulation or introduce some new source of energy or information, we are increasing the probability that one of these changes will weaken the stability of the entire system, by cutting down the variety of response.⁵⁷

Unlike those who predict the destruction of the entire Earth, Lovelock sees, as more likely, the destruction of a species.⁵⁸ One may logically infer that one such species is homo sapiens. Overall then, rather than destroying the Earth, we are destroying the Earth habitat which enables our existence. Consequently we are jeopardizing our own survival. The Earth will likely survive for, as Lovelock has suggested, "[a] system as experienced as Gaia is unlikely to be easily disturbed."⁵⁹ The question is whether we will alter our environment to such an extent as to cause Gaia to make survival modifications which result in the elimination of our

48. *Id.* at vii.

49. *Id.* at 9.

50. *Id.* at 127.

51. *Id.*

52. *Id.*

53. *Id.*

54. *Id.* at 48.

55. *Id.* at 128.

56. *Id.*

57. *Id.* at 131.

58. *Id.* at 126-27.

59. *Id.* at 132.

species.

One may wonder what Lovelock's Gaian theory has to do with the development of a new myth or story in which we can ground our environmental laws. For one, Lovelock's theory of Gaia refutes man's notion that science is supreme and that humans rule the Earth. Lovelock's hypothesis, then, helps man to recognize, through scientific concepts, our role in the biosphere. Through this notion we begin to see the interaction of science and narration in enabling man to relocate himself in the universe, such that he can lead a more meaningful existence.⁶⁰

Myth, dreams and imagination are interrelated.⁶¹ Earlier, I pointed out that Joseph Campbell saw myths not as true or untrue, but as effective or ineffective. So too, William Irwin Thompson, in his introduction to *Gaia: A Way of Knowing*, stated: "The imagination . . . is not a source of deception and delusion, but a capacity to sense what you do not know, to intuit what you cannot understand, to *be* more than you can know."⁶² Thompson further opined that it is "precisely because we are more than we know that science can never embrace the totality of Being."⁶³

What is needed is a mixture of narration and science. Pure stories have no meaning for us, because our technological advancements belie any truth in such tales. Additionally, pure science is unsatisfactory as it is merely a series of facts and as there are still many things beyond the comprehension of science.⁶⁴ Therefore, the satisfactory story which will help ground humans in the universe

60. Campbell with Moyers, *The Power of Myth* at 32-3 (cited in note 1):
Moyers: Scientists are beginning to talk quite openly about the Gaia principle.
Campbell: There you are, the whole planet as an organism.

Moyers: Mother Earth. Will new myths come from this image?

Campbell: [T]he only myth that is going to be worth thinking about in the immediate future is one that is talking about the planet. . . . And what it will have to deal with will be exactly what all myths have dealt with—the maturation of the individual from dependency through adulthood, through maturity, and then to the exit; and then how to relate to this society and how to relate this society to the world of nature and the cosmos. That's what the myths have all talked about, and what this one's got to talk about. But the society that it's got to talk about is the society of the planet. And until that gets going, you don't have anything.

Moyers: So you suggest that from this begins the new myth of our time?

Campbell: Yes, this is the ground of what the myth is to be.

61. Campbell, *The Inner Reaches of Outer Space* at 55 (cited in note 36).

62. Thompson, *Gaia: A Way of Knowing* at 8 (cited in note 24).

63. *Id.* at 9.

64. See Thomas Berry, *Wonderworld as Wasteworld: The Earth in Deficit*, 35 *Cross-currents* 408, 421 (Winter 1985-86), wherein the author notes that "scientists themselves are awakening to the wonder and mystery of the universe."

must be a combination of the two. The tale must present our scientific knowledge in a narrative which instills in us an awe or wonder for the yet unknown.⁶⁵

The chief proponent of a notion somewhat similar to what I term a mixture of narration and science is Thomas Berry. Berry suggests: "[It is] all a question of story. We are in trouble just now because we do not have a good story. We are in-between stories."⁶⁶ "What is needed is a new paradigm which helps us understand what it is to be human."⁶⁷ Berry points out that creation must be seen as both psychic-spiritual and material-physical, i.e., science plus narration.⁶⁸

According to Berry, our great story of the universe will have four primary stages: the galactic story; the earth story; the life story; and the human story.⁶⁹ The key for us humans is to see ourselves as integral to this process since we are "that being in whom the universe reflects on and celebrates itself in conscious self-awareness."⁷⁰ Berry's primary distinction from Lovelock is that he sees humans as being something special, whereas Lovelock sees us as just another species in the biosphere, albeit one with greater influence than all others.

Author Sean McDonagh also speaks of our need for a new story or myth of the emergence of Earth:

Since the dawn of human consciousness, story has been the basic vehicle of human understanding and meaning. In every culture, throughout history, storytellers have enthralled and delighted people and brought joy and meaning to their lives.⁷¹

For McDonagh this story will come to us through "modern ways of

65. As one author has pointed out: "It is increasingly clear that the complex interactions in the atmosphere, and between the atmosphere and the biosphere, exceed anything that we can wholly master, either intellectually or in practice." Stephen Toulmin, *The Case for Cosmic Prudence*, 56 Tenn L Rev 29, 32 (1988).

66. Thomas Berry, *The New Story: Comments on the Origin, Identification and Transmission of Values*, 37 Crosscurrents 187, 187 (Summer/Fall 1987).

67. Berry, *The Dream of the Earth* at 132-33 (cited in note 6).

68. Berry, 35 Crosscurrents at 417 (cited in note 64). Berry also states that "[t]his new story constitutes, it seems, a new revelatory experience which can be understood as soon as we recognize that the evolutionary process is from the beginning a spiritual as well as a physical process." Berry, 35 Crosscurrents at 421 (cited in note 64). "Myths are clues to the spiritual potentialities of the human life." Campbell with Moyers, *The Power of Myth* at 5 (cited in note 1).

69. Berry, 35 Crosscurrents at 417 (cited in note 64).

70. Id.

71. McDonagh, *To Care for the Earth* at 77 (cited in note 16).

knowing," i.e., science.⁷² Therefore, the storytellers of our new myth will be the scientists, those who have developed an exciting new tale of our universe in which man plays a meaningful role.⁷³ Speaking of ecologists, author Stephen Larsen states:

[T]hey have become the spokesmen of a spiritual principle, of a multidimensional quest which involves the well-being of us all . . . They are the guides, the Moses and Aaron, who offer to lead us out of our present wilderness, our place of exile from nature.⁷⁴

Our new story will provide humans with norms, norms which will result in a mutually enriching human-Earth relationship.⁷⁵ As with any myth, our new story will have positive results. Human life will have deeper meaning. We will be encouraged to foster and nurture a healthier and more habitable planet, in recognition of the awesomeness of the Gaia and the importance of our role in the biosphere. Hence, our environmental laws will have new depth of meaning. Just as it is unquestionable that such things as murder and theft are, for the most part, morally wrong, so too will it be morally wrong to pollute a stream or emit toxins into the atmosphere.

Ella A. Kwisnek

72. Id.

73. Id.

74. Larsen, *The Shaman's Doorway* at 163 (cited in note 20).

75. McDonagh, *To Care for the Earth* at 81 (cited in note 16).

