

## From the Editors

Our second issue picks up the general theme of the first issue, environmental ethics, the challenges of climate change, and our relationship to nature. In her contribution 'Environmental Ethics as Environmental Ontology', Elisa Cavazza explores the parallels between Buddhist teachings and Arne Naess' 'Deep Ecology'. Cavazza shows how Naess, consciously and unconsciously, picks up ideas that have been central to Buddhist teachings. Cavazza's paper urges us to reconsider our moral attitude, toward the conception of a processual, embedded self, as we find it both in Naess' philosophy and in Buddhist sources.

The second paper in this issue, Casey Rentmeester's 'Do No Harm: A Cross-Cultural, Cross-Disciplinary Climate Ethics', takes a very simple principle and applies it to a global issue: the idea that we ought not harm other human beings unnecessarily. Rentmeester's paper attempts to shift the focus in climate ethics: from international and global responses and political responsibility to the everyday decisions we all face, and the personal contribution many of us are able to make. The particular attraction of Rentmeester's approach is that it is not committed to any theoretical background, and thus wholly independent of religious or political commitments.

It might seem that Cavazza's paper represents the 'abstract' or the 'spiritual' side of the issue while Rentmeester pushes a hands-on, practical approach. But I believe that this would be a mistaken generalization. Rentmeester's practical conclusions, to become effective, presuppose something like an attitude shift, as we find it in Cavazza's paper. Why would we want to abstain from unnecessarily contributing to climate change through our lifestyle choice, if we didn't have reason to see ourselves as interwoven both with the environment we live in, and the other people who inhabit it? Conversely, it makes sense to say that Cavazza's paper, despite its 'abstract' appearance, is deeply practical. 'Ecosophy' as well as Buddhism are teachings not just on how to see the world and perceive one's place in it, they are teachings about how to interact with this world.

So despite their apparent differences in scope, tone, and method, I believe that the two contributions for this issue complement each other very well. They bridge the gap between the theoretical and the practical, and incidentally, also the gap between the religious and the secular. Cavazza's paper tracks the religious inspirations of the 'secular' philosopher Naess. Rentmeester's paper, with its clear analytic bent, should nevertheless resonate with ethicists who approach the discipline from a religious background.

And thus the present issue represents the full scope and the richness of the discipline of ethics that we want to promote in this journal. In just two papers, it connects ontology and practice, religion and philosophical analysis, abstraction and the concrete. We hope that we can continue the journal on this path, and we hope that our readers will enjoy reading these contributions as much as we did.