Desarrollo Sostenible e Innovación Global. 2026; 3(2):45
doi: 10.63688/desarrollo.v3.i2.45

ORIGINAL

Eco Doxology: An Interfaith Response to the Ecological Crisis

Eco doxología: una respuesta interreligiosa a la crisis ecológica

Ikechukwu Monday Osebor[1]

[1] University of Delta, Agbor, Nigeria

Submitted: 02-07-2026 | Revised: 20-07-2026 | Accepted: 08-10-2026 | Published: 10-10-2026

Corresponding Author: Ikechukwu Monday Osebor

ABSTRACT

Objective: To critically examine eco-short-termism as an ethical dimension of the ecological crisis and to develop eco-doxology as an interfaith framework oriented toward long-term environmental responsibility. Methodology: A qualitative, documentary, and theoretical-interpretive study was conducted using philosophical and conceptual analysis. The core corpus consisted of 40 academic articles indexed in Scopus, complemented by foundational works and the primary source required for the development of the concept of eco-doxology. The search prioritized studies on environmental short-termism, intergenerational ethics, religion and climate change, interfaith environmentalism, Indigenous ecological knowledge, environmental pragmatism, and ecological degradation. Results: The analysis identified six themes: ecological limits, short-term decision-making, intergenerational responsibility, religious environmental ethics, Indigenous ecological knowledge, and eco-doxology. The literature indicates that environmental costs generated by decisions focused on immediate benefits may persist far longer than those benefits. It also shows that different religious and Indigenous traditions contain principles of responsibility, restraint, interdependence, and care for nature that can support environmental cooperation. Conclusion: Eco-doxology is proposed as a complementary ethical framework, rather than a substitute for environmental science or policy, capable of connecting reverence, intergenerational justice, Indigenous knowledge, and interfaith environmental action.

Keywords: eco-short-termism; eco-doxology; environmental ethics; interfaith environmentalism; Indigenous ecological knowledge.

RESUMEN

Objetivo: Examinar críticamente el eco-cortoplacismo como dimensión ética de la crisis ecológica y desarrollar la eco-doxología como un marco interreligioso orientado a la responsabilidad ambiental de largo plazo. Metodología: Se realizó una investigación cualitativa, documental y teórico-interpretativa basada en análisis filosófico y conceptual. El corpus principal estuvo conformado por 40 artículos académicos indexados en Scopus, complementados por obras fundacionales y la fuente primaria necesaria para el desarrollo del concepto de eco-doxología. La búsqueda priorizó estudios sobre cortoplacismo ambiental, ética intergeneracional, religión y cambio climático, ambientalismo interreligioso, conocimiento ecológico indígena, pragmatismo ambiental y degradación ecológica. Resultados: El análisis identificó seis ejes: límites ecológicos, toma de decisiones cortoplacista, responsabilidad intergeneracional, ética ambiental religiosa, conocimiento ecológico indígena y eco-doxología. Las fuentes muestran que los costos ambientales de decisiones orientadas al beneficio inmediato pueden persistir durante periodos considerablemente mayores que sus beneficios. Asimismo, distintas tradiciones religiosas e indígenas contienen principios de responsabilidad, moderación, interdependencia y cuidado de la naturaleza que pueden favorecer la cooperación ambiental. Conclusión: La eco-doxología se propone como un marco ético complementario, no sustitutivo de la ciencia o la política ambiental, capaz de vincular reverencia, justicia intergeneracional, conocimiento indígena y acción interreligiosa.

Palabras clave: eco-cortoplacismo; eco-doxología; ética ambiental; ambientalismo interreligioso; conocimiento ecológico indígena.

© 2026, The Authors. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY 4.0).

INTRODUCTION

The contemporary ecological crisis is expressed through climate change, biodiversity loss, deforestation, pollution, resource depletion, and the progressive destabilization of ecological systems. Evidence from Earth-system research shows that several planetary boundaries associated with ecological stability and resilience have already been exceeded, while human-driven biodiversity decline continues to intensify across regions and ecosystems[1-4]. These processes are not exclusively technical or economic problems. They also involve ethical decisions concerning how present societies value nature, distribute environmental risks, and assume responsibility toward future generations.

One factor contributing to this crisis is the tendency to privilege immediate benefits over long-term ecological stability. In environmental governance, short-termism can emerge when political institutions, corporations, or individuals prioritize rapid economic growth, electoral incentives, immediate consumption, or temporary environmental responses while postponing structural measures whose benefits may only become visible over decades[5,6]. This tendency becomes ethically problematic when present advantages are achieved at the cost of environmental degradation and reduced opportunities for future generations. In this study, eco-short-termism is understood as the environmental expression of decision-making focused on immediate gains despite foreseeable long-term ecological consequences.

The problem is particularly visible in regions where extractive activities generate significant economic benefits while local communities experience persistent environmental costs. In the Niger Delta, decades of petroleum exploitation have contributed to oil contamination, degradation of mangrove ecosystems, biodiversity loss, and disruption of livelihoods dependent on fishing and agriculture[7,8]. Such cases show that environmental short-termism is not limited to individual behavior; it can also be embedded in institutional and economic structures that externalize ecological costs while concentrating short-term benefits.

Consumer culture reinforces similar dynamics. The rapid production and disposal of plastics and the environmental burden associated with sectors such as fast fashion illustrate how immediate convenience can increase material extraction, waste generation, and long-term ecological pressure[9,10]. These practices reveal a deeper ethical tension between short-term satisfaction and the ecological conditions required for long-term human and non-human well-being.

The moral dimensions of the ecological crisis have also generated sustained debate within religious and philosophical traditions. White's influential critique linked Western Christianity with anthropocentric interpretations of human dominion over nature[11]. Subsequent scholarship, however, has shown that the relationship between religion and environmental attitudes is more complex and varies according to doctrine, community, interpretation, and social context[12,13]. Religious traditions may contribute to environmental disengagement in some settings, but they may also provide narratives of stewardship, restraint, interconnectedness, responsibility, and care for creation.

This complexity creates an opportunity for interfaith environmental ethics. Christianity, Islam, Buddhism, Hinduism, and Indigenous traditions differ substantially in doctrine and cosmology, yet each contains ethical resources that can support ecological responsibility. Comparative scholarship has identified recurring themes related to stewardship, moderation, sacredness, interconnectedness, and responsibility toward the natural world[12-14]. These traditions should not be treated as equivalent, but their areas of convergence may provide a basis for cooperation in environmental education, conservation, climate action, and community-based resource management.

Within this context, the present study develops eco-doxology as an interfaith ecological framework. The concept has previously been formulated as an approach that interprets environmental care as an expression of praise and reverence toward creation[15]. The present study extends that proposal by connecting it with intergenerational ethics, Indigenous ecological knowledge, and interfaith cooperation. Rather than presenting spirituality as an alternative to scientific environmental management, the framework explores how ethical and religious motivations can complement scientific knowledge, public policy, and collective environmental action.

Accordingly, this study aims to critically examine eco-short-termism as an ethical dimension of the ecological crisis and to develop eco-doxology as a philosophical and interfaith response oriented toward long-term ecological responsibility. Through philosophical and conceptual analysis, the study evaluates the relationship between short-term environmental decision-making, intergenerational ethics, religious ecological values, and Indigenous knowledge, while identifying both the possibilities and the limitations of interfaith cooperation in environmental conservation.

A further gap concerns the fragmentation of these debates. Research on short-term climate governance, religious environmental ethics, and Indigenous ecological knowledge has generally developed through separate disciplinary conversations5,6,12-14. As a result, comparatively little attention has been given to how temporal responsibility, spiritual motivation, and place-based ecological knowledge can be interpreted within a single philosophical framework. Eco-doxology is examined here as a possible point of articulation among these fields, while preserving the distinction between empirical environmental science, normative ethics, religious traditions, and Indigenous knowledge systems.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study employed a qualitative, documentary, and theoretical-interpretive design based on philosophical and conceptual analysis. The approach was selected to examine eco-short-termism as an ethical dimension of the ecological crisis and to develop eco-doxology as an interfaith framework oriented toward long-term environmental responsibility. The study did not involve empirical measurement or human participants; instead, it focused on critical interpretation and comparison of published academic literature.

The analytical corpus comprised 40 peer-reviewed articles indexed in Scopus, supplemented by a limited number of seminal philosophical works and the primary source required for the historical and conceptual development of eco-doxology. Scopus was used as the principal database for source selection, while Crossref, Web of Science, and official journal platforms were consulted when necessary to verify authorship, publication data, DOI records, and bibliographic consistency. Preference was given to studies published between 2000 and 2026, although earlier publications were retained when they represented foundational contributions to environmental ethics, ecological philosophy, religion and nature, or long-term environmental governance.

The search strategy combined terms such as environmental short-termism, ecological short-termism, climate short-termism, intergenerational environmental ethics, religion and climate change, religious environmental ethics, interfaith environmentalism, eco-theology, Indigenous ecological knowledge, traditional ecological knowledge, environmental pragmatism, sacred nature, environmental stewardship, and Niger Delta environmental degradation. Boolean operators AND and OR were used to connect environmental, ethical, religious, and philosophical dimensions.

Studies were included when they directly addressed at least one of the following areas: ecological degradation, environmental short-termism, long-term environmental governance, intergenerational responsibility, religious environmental ethics, Indigenous ecological knowledge, spirituality and nature, or community-based environmental management. Priority was given to publications with verifiable DOI records and clear relevance to the conceptual argument. Duplicates, incomplete bibliographic records, studies unrelated to environmental issues, and publications in which short-termism referred exclusively to medical, psychological, or unrelated organizational contexts were excluded.

The analytical procedure was conducted in four stages. First, conceptual clarification was used to distinguish short-termism, eco-short-termism, environmental pragmatism, intergenerational responsibility, interfaith environmentalism, and eco-doxology. Second, argumentative analysis identified how the literature explains the prioritization of immediate economic, political, or social benefits over long-term ecological consequences. Third, a comparative analysis examined ecological principles associated with Christianity, Islam, Buddhism, Hinduism, and Indigenous traditions without assuming doctrinal equivalence. Finally, a philosophical synthesis integrated these findings into an eco-doxological framework based on ecological responsibility, intergenerational ethics, sacredness of nature, Indigenous knowledge, and interfaith cooperation.

For analytical organization, six categories were established: ecological crisis and environmental limits; eco-short-termism and decision-making; intergenerational responsibility; religion and environmental ethics; Indigenous ecological knowledge; and eco-doxology as an interfaith ecological framework. Because the study relied exclusively on published documentary sources and did not involve human participants, personal data, or experimental procedures, ethical approval and informed consent were not required.

RESULTS

Ecological crisis and environmental limits

The philosophical and documentary analysis identified six interrelated themes connecting ecological short-termism, environmental ethics, religious traditions, Indigenous knowledge, and the development of eco-doxology. The first theme concerns the systemic character of ecological degradation. Climate change, biodiversity loss, pollution, intensive resource extraction, and disruptions of Earth-system processes interact rather than occur as isolated environmental problems[1-4]. This indicates that ecological deterioration is associated not only with technological limitations but also with patterns of production and decision-making that prioritize immediate benefits while transferring environmental costs to later periods.

This dynamic is particularly visible in extractive regions. In the Niger Delta, petroleum exploitation has been associated with contamination of aquatic and terrestrial environments, degradation of mangroves, biodiversity loss, and disruption of livelihoods[7,8]. Additional studies report persistent problems involving oil spills, aquatic ecosystem damage, contamination of biodiversity hotspots, and social tensions linked to resource degradation[32-34]. These findings illustrate how short-term economic returns can coexist with environmental and social costs that remain long after the initial benefits have been obtained.

Eco-short-termism and environmental decision-making

The conceptual analysis indicates that eco-short-termism can be understood as a pattern of environmental decision-making in which immediate political, economic, or social advantages receive greater weight than long-term ecological stability. This does not imply that every short-term environmental intervention is negative. Emergency responses may be essential when ecosystems or communities face immediate risks. The ethical problem emerges when temporary measures repeatedly replace structural solutions or when immediate gains systematically outweigh foreseeable long-term consequences[5,6].

Research on climate governance shows that long-term policies face particular difficulties because their benefits frequently extend beyond electoral, corporate, and investment cycles (5,6). This temporal imbalance generates a conflict between present incentives and future environmental needs. Eco-short-termism therefore differs from pragmatic responsiveness: the former systematically discounts delayed ecological consequences, whereas the latter may remain compatible with long-term adaptation when decisions are revised in light of evidence.

Intergenerational responsibility

A third finding concerns the ethical relationship between present and future generations. Climate change and ecosystem degradation generate temporal asymmetries because many environmental benefits are consumed in the present while negative effects may persist for decades or centuries. Intergenerational environmental ethics challenges this imbalance by questioning whether current populations are morally justified in transferring disproportionate environmental burdens to future societies[16,17].

From this perspective, ecological responsibility requires extending moral consideration beyond immediate interests. Long-term environmental protection involves conserving ecological conditions that allow future populations to satisfy their needs without inheriting irreversible levels of degradation. Consequently, eco-short-termism is not merely inefficient resource management; it represents an ethical tension concerning justice, responsibility, and the temporal distribution of environmental benefits and harms.

Religion and environmental ethics

The analysis of religious-environmental literature shows that the relationship between religion and ecological behavior is neither uniform nor automatic. Religious affiliation alone does not necessarily produce stronger environmental attitudes. Environmental concern varies according to interpretation, institutional context, community practice, and theological orientation[12,13,18,19]. This finding complicates interpretations based exclusively on White's historical critique of Christianity, since subsequent research documents both anthropocentric and stewardship-oriented responses within Christian communities[20,21].

Nevertheless, the literature identifies ethical resources that can support environmental responsibility. Studies of religious communities and sustainability show that stewardship, moral accountability, restraint, and community participation can contribute to environmental concern,

local energy transitions, and community-based natural resource management[22-24]. Comparative environmental ethics also indicates that Christian, Islamic, Buddhist, Hindu, and other religious traditions contain distinct but potentially convergent resources for ecological responsibility[14]. The relevant result is therefore not that religions produce identical ecological ethics, but that different traditions can provide moral languages capable of supporting cooperation around specific environmental responsibilities.

Indigenous ecological knowledge and long-term stewardship

A fifth thematic result concerns Indigenous and local ecological knowledge. The reviewed studies show that Indigenous knowledge systems incorporate observations, values, practices, and social institutions developed through long-term relationships with particular ecosystems25. Their relevance extends beyond cultural preservation because Indigenous territories and management practices contribute to biodiversity conservation and ecosystem resilience in many regions (26).

Evidence also demonstrates the value of Indigenous knowledge in climate adaptation, biodiversity management, environmental assessment, and conservation27-30. Sacred natural sites provide an additional example of how cultural and spiritual values may support biodiversity protection when they are embedded in community institutions and locally recognized responsibilities29. In Australia, Indigenous fire-management approaches demonstrate how long-term ecological knowledge can be connected with contemporary ecosystem management31.

The analysis also indicates that Indigenous knowledge should not be treated as a uniform body of traditional practices or extracted from the cultural contexts in which it developed. Effective integration requires participation by knowledge holders, recognition of local governance, and dialogue between Indigenous and scientific knowledge systems25,30. These findings are particularly relevant to eco-doxology because they broaden environmental ethics beyond exclusively institutional or technological approaches and emphasize relational understandings of humans, ecosystems, communities, and future generations.

Eco-doxology as an interfaith ecological framework

The final analytical result is the construction of eco-doxology as a framework connecting spiritual reverence with long-term ecological responsibility. In its earlier formulation, eco-doxology interpreted care for nature as an expression of praise and ecological responsibility15. The present analysis extends this idea by incorporating intergenerational ethics, interfaith cooperation, and Indigenous ecological knowledge.

Eco-doxology does not propose replacing environmental science, public policy, or conservation management with religious practice. Instead, it operates at the level of ethical motivation and normative orientation. Scientific knowledge can identify ecological risks and possible interventions, while eco-doxology addresses why communities may understand environmental care as a moral responsibility extending beyond immediate economic utility.

The comparative analysis identified five recurring principles that can support this framework: reverence for life and nature, restraint in resource use, responsibility for future generations, relational understandings of human and ecological well-being, and collective stewardship. These principles are expressed differently across religious and Indigenous traditions and should not be interpreted as evidence of doctrinal equivalence. Eco-doxology can therefore be understood as a dialogical framework whose potential lies in providing common ethical ground for environmental education, community conservation, restoration initiatives, climate advocacy, and interfaith environmental cooperation.

Across the reviewed literature, four recurrent mechanisms help explain eco-short-termism. The first is temporal mismatch: ecological processes frequently unfold over decades, while political mandates, investment decisions, and organizational targets are evaluated over much shorter periods5,6. The second is the externalization of costs, whereby environmental damage is displaced geographically or temporally toward communities and generations that receive fewer immediate benefits. The third is uncertainty, which can be used to postpone preventive action even when long-term risks are substantial. The fourth is institutional fragmentation, because responsibility for ecological outcomes is often distributed across governments, firms, consumers, and communities. Together, these mechanisms indicate that eco-short-termism is not reducible to individual impatience; it can be reproduced through institutional arrangements that systematically favor present benefits over future ecological resilience (16,17).

The interfaith comparison also revealed that similar ethical vocabulary can carry different meanings across traditions. Christian stewardship may emphasize responsibility for creation,

while Islamic environmental ethics commonly develops responsibility through trusteeship, balance, moderation, and accountability. Buddhist ecological interpretations often emphasize interdependence, compassion, and non-harm, whereas Hindu environmental thought frequently associates natural entities and cosmic order with sacred value12-14. These concepts should not be merged into a single theology. Their analytical value lies instead in showing that environmental responsibility can be expressed through multiple moral languages, allowing cooperation around shared ecological practices without requiring doctrinal agreement.

The reviewed Indigenous literature further indicates that ecological knowledge cannot be separated from governance, territory, and cultural continuity. Studies on Indigenous lands, climate adaptation, sacred natural sites, environmental assessment, and fire management show that ecological outcomes are shaped not only by accumulated observations but also by institutions that regulate access, responsibility, and transmission of knowledge25-31. This distinction is relevant to eco-doxology because an interfaith ecological framework risks becoming superficial if it adopts Indigenous concepts merely as symbolic illustrations. Meaningful inclusion requires recognition of communities as knowledge holders and decision-making actors.

These findings also identify practical domains in which eco-doxological principles could be explored without overstating their current evidence base. Environmental education could connect scientific explanations of ecological degradation with ethical reflection on responsibility; interfaith organizations could support locally defined conservation or restoration initiatives; and community-based environmental programs could create dialogue between religious institutions, Indigenous knowledge holders, and environmental professionals23-25,30. These applications remain propositions derived from the conceptual synthesis rather than demonstrated outcomes, and therefore require empirical assessment.

DISCUSSION

The findings support the view that ecological degradation is not only a biophysical problem but also a temporal and ethical one. The concept of eco-short-termism helps explain situations in which immediate economic, political, or social benefits are prioritized despite foreseeable long-term environmental costs. This interpretation is consistent with research on climate governance showing that institutional incentives often operate on shorter time horizons than ecological processes5,6. The distinction is important because immediate action may be necessary during environmental emergencies, while repeated substitution of temporary measures for structural responses can intensify long-term vulnerability.

The intergenerational dimension of the findings is reinforced by evidence on material consumption and pollution. Patterns of affluence can intensify resource use and environmental pressure, suggesting that technological efficiency alone may be insufficient when consumption continues to expand (35). Research on plastic pollution likewise indicates that large-scale reductions require systemic changes across production, consumption, waste management, and policy rather than isolated interventions (36). These findings strengthen the ethical argument that present generations should evaluate not only immediate benefits but also the durability and distribution of ecological costs.

The analysis of religion produced a more nuanced result than the assumption that religious belief is inherently beneficial or detrimental to environmental protection. White's critique remains historically influential11, but later research demonstrates substantial variation within religious communities12,13,18-21. Evidence from climate communication further suggests that religious framing can influence the way some communities interpret environmental problems, making leadership and narrative context relevant to ecological engagement37. Eco-doxology therefore gains plausibility not by assuming that religion automatically produces pro-environmental behavior, but by identifying specific ethical resources that can be mobilized in particular social settings.

This point supports the proposed interfaith dimension of eco-doxology. The framework does not depend on demonstrating that Christianity, Islam, Buddhism, Hinduism, and Indigenous traditions share identical doctrines. Instead, it identifies areas of ethical convergence that can support practical cooperation while maintaining doctrinal differences12-14,22-24. Its contribution is principally normative: scientific evidence describes ecological risks and possible interventions, whereas religious and ethical frameworks may influence how responsibility, obligation, restraint, and stewardship are interpreted within communities.

Indigenous ecological knowledge further expands the framework by challenging purely instrumental relationships with nature. Reviews from Australia show that Indigenous biocultural

knowledge can contribute to ecosystem science and environmental management when it is incorporated through respectful and participatory arrangements (38). Research on fire regimes also demonstrates that Indigenous and local practices can contribute to contemporary landscape management when ecological knowledge is connected with scientific assessment and institutional support (39). In Latin America, agroecological scholarship similarly emphasizes the role of traditional knowledge, diversified production, and local autonomy in building resilient food systems (40).

These findings require caution. Indigenous ecological knowledge should not be detached from its cultural context or treated as a technical resource available for external appropriation. The significance of these systems lies partly in long-term relationships between communities, territories, and institutions. Consequently, any eco-doxological framework that incorporates Indigenous knowledge must recognize participation, cultural continuity, and the autonomy of knowledge holders rather than merely extracting selected environmental practices.

The Niger Delta provides a contrasting example of the consequences associated with extractive priorities. Research consistently documents oil pollution, mangrove degradation, aquatic impacts, biodiversity loss, and persistent effects on local communities7,8,32,33. The connection between environmental degradation and social conflict also illustrates how ecological costs can become intertwined with governance, livelihoods, and community stability (34). Eco-short-termism is therefore better understood as an institutional as well as an individual pattern, since economic benefits may be realized rapidly while environmental restoration and social consequences extend across much longer periods.

The distinction between eco-short-termism and pragmatism is also conceptually important. Pragmatism does not inherently imply disregard for future consequences; its philosophical development emphasizes practical consequences, experience, and revision in light of outcomes41. Eco-short-termism represents a narrower distortion in which immediate utility is granted excessive weight and delayed ecological consequences are systematically discounted. This distinction allows the study to criticize present-oriented environmental decision-making without rejecting adaptive or practical approaches to environmental governance.

Taken together, the findings suggest that eco-doxology can contribute to environmental ethics through three complementary functions. First, it provides a moral critique of decisions that systematically privilege immediate benefits over long-term ecological integrity. Second, it identifies areas of convergence among religious and Indigenous ethical traditions without erasing their differences. Third, it links environmental responsibility with intergenerational obligations and collective stewardship. These functions position eco-doxology as a complementary ethical orientation rather than a self-sufficient environmental policy.

Several limitations must be acknowledged. Eco-doxology remains a developing philosophical concept and has not yet been empirically tested as a predictor of environmental behavior or policy effectiveness. Interfaith cooperation may be constrained by doctrinal disagreement, institutional competition, socioeconomic inequality, and political context. Religious or spiritual motivation alone cannot resolve structural drivers of environmental degradation such as fossil-fuel dependence, weak regulation, or unsustainable production systems. Future research should therefore examine eco-doxological principles in specific communities and evaluate whether they are associated with measurable environmental practices when combined with scientific knowledge, participatory governance, and public policy.

The proposed framework therefore has a deliberately limited scope. Eco-doxology is most defensible when treated as a source of ethical orientation rather than as a causal theory of environmental behavior. Religious belief, sacred language, or interfaith dialogue cannot by themselves guarantee conservation outcomes. Their relevance depends on whether moral commitments become connected with institutions, material resources, education, and practices that can be evaluated over time22-24,37. This distinction prevents the framework from attributing ecological effectiveness to spirituality without evidence.

The same caution applies to the use of Indigenous knowledge. Evidence supporting Indigenous contributions to biodiversity conservation and ecosystem management does not justify treating all Indigenous practices as environmentally beneficial in every context. Ecological knowledge is place-specific, historically situated, and continually adapted25,27,30,38. The contribution of eco-doxology should therefore be to support respectful dialogue and long-term responsibility, not to absorb Indigenous knowledge into a generalized spiritual narrative. Recognition of rights, participation, and authority over knowledge remains essential.

From a policy perspective, the concept of eco-short-termism may be useful as a diagnostic category when environmental decisions produce clear temporal asymmetries. It directs attention to who receives immediate benefits, who bears delayed costs, and whether decision-making

institutions adequately represent future ecological interests. However, the concept requires further operationalization before it can be used as an empirical variable. Future studies could develop indicators related to policy time horizons, ecological cost externalization, intergenerational distribution, and continuity of environmental commitments, allowing the philosophical proposal to be tested in concrete governance settings.

CONCLUSIONS

Eco-short-termism can be understood as an ethical pattern of environmental decision-making in which immediate political, economic, or social benefits are prioritized over long-term ecological stability. Its relevance lies in explaining how present-oriented choices can transfer environmental costs to future generations and reinforce persistent ecological degradation.

The analysis shows that religious traditions do not provide a uniform environmental response. However, Christianity, Islam, Buddhism, Hinduism, and Indigenous worldviews contain ethical principles related to stewardship, restraint, interconnectedness, responsibility, and respect for nature that can support environmental cooperation without assuming doctrinal equivalence.

Indigenous ecological knowledge strengthens long-term environmental management by integrating locally grounded experience, cultural values, and relational understandings of ecosystems. Its incorporation into environmental frameworks should respect the autonomy, participation, and cultural context of Indigenous communities rather than treating such knowledge as an isolated technical resource.

Eco-doxology is proposed as a complementary interfaith ethical framework that links ecological responsibility, intergenerational justice, spiritual reverence, and collective stewardship. It should not replace environmental science, public policy, or conservation management, but may contribute to the moral motivation required for sustained ecological action. Future studies should evaluate its applicability in specific communities and its relationship with measurable environmental practices.

REFERENCES

1. Rockström J, Gupta J, Qin D, et al. Safe and just Earth system boundaries. Nature. 2023;619:102-111. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-023-06083-8
2. Richardson K, Steffen W, Lucht W, et al. Earth beyond six of nine planetary boundaries. Sci Adv. 2023;9(37):eadh2458. https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.adh2458
3. Steffen W, Richardson K, Rockström J, et al. Planetary boundaries: Guiding human development on a changing planet. Science. 2015;347(6223):1259855. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1259855
4. Díaz S, Settele J, Brondízio ES, et al. Pervasive human-driven decline of life on Earth points to the need for transformative change. Science. 2019;366(6471):eaax3100. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aax3100
5. Caney S. Global climate governance, short-termism, and the vulnerability of future generations. Ethics Int Aff. 2022;36(2):137-155. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0892679422000181
6. Hovi J, Sprinz DF, Underdal A. Implementing long-term climate policy: Time inconsistency, domestic politics, international anarchy. Glob Environ Polit. 2009;9(3):20-39. https://doi.org/10.1162/glep.2009.9.3.20
7. Onyena AP, Sam K. A review of the threat of oil exploitation to mangrove ecosystem: Insights from Niger Delta, Nigeria. Glob Ecol Conserv. 2020;22:e00961. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gecco.2020.e00961
8. Ukhurebor KE, Athar H, Adetunji CO, Aigbe UO, Onyancha RB, Abifarin O. Environmental implications of petroleum spillages in the Niger Delta region of Nigeria: A review. J Environ Manage. 2021;293:112872. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2021.112872
9. Geyer R, Jambeck JR, Law KL. Production, use, and fate of all plastics ever made. Sci Adv. 2017;3(7):e1700782. https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.1700782
10. Niinimäki K, Peters G, Dahlbo H, Perry P, Rissanen T, Gwilt A. The environmental price of fast fashion. Nat Rev Earth Environ. 2020;1:189-200. https://doi.org/10.1038/s43017-020-0039-9
11. White L Jr. The historical roots of our ecologic crisis. Science. 1967;155(3767):1203-1207. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.155.3767.1203
12. Jenkins W, Berry E, Kreider LB. Religion and climate change. Annu Rev Environ Resour. 2018;43:85-108. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-environ-102017-025855
13. Haluza-DeLay R. Religion and climate change: Varieties in viewpoints and practices. WIREs Clim Change. 2014;5(2):261-279. https://doi.org/10.1002/wcc.268
14. Zagonari F. Comparing religious environmental ethics to support efforts to achieve local and global sustainability: Empirical insights based on a theoretical framework. Sustainability. 2020;12(7):2590. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12072590
15. Osebor IM. Eco-Doxology: A liturgical awareness to restraining biodiversity loss. NAJOP: Nasara Journal of Philosophy. 2024;9(1).
16. Gardiner SM. A perfect moral storm: Climate change, intergenerational ethics and the problem of moral corruption. Environ Values. 2006;15(3):397-413. https://doi.org/10.3197/096327106778226293
17. Page EA. Fairness on the day after tomorrow: Justice, reciprocity and global climate change. Polit Stud. 2007;55(1):225-242. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9248.2007.00649.x
18. Arbuckle MB, Konisky DM. The role of religion in environmental attitudes. Soc Sci Q. 2015;96(5):1244-1263. https://doi.org/10.1111/ssqu.12213
19. Sherkat DE, Ellison CG. Structuring the religion-environment connection: Identifying religious influences on environmental concern and activism. J Sci Study Relig. 2007;46(1):71-85. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5906.2007.00341.x
20. Clements JM, Xiao C, McCright AM. An examination of the 'greening of Christianity' thesis among Americans, 1993-2010. J Sci Study Relig. 2014;53(2):373-391. https://doi.org/10.1111/jssr.12116
21. Djupe PA, Hunt PK. Beyond the Lynn White thesis: Congregational effects on environmental concern. J Sci Study Relig. 2009;48(4):670-686. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5906.2009.01472.x
22. Koehrsen J. Does religion promote environmental sustainability? Exploring the role of religion in local energy transitions. Soc Compass. 2015;62(3):296-310. https://doi.org/10.1177/0037768615587808
23. Pasaribu D, Takwin B, Martens P. The role of religious narratives and religious orientation towards concerns for the natural environment and animal welfare. PLoS One. 2022;17(8):e0271515. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0271515
24. Cox M, Villamayor-Tomas S, Hartberg Y. The role of religion in community-based natural resource management. World Dev. 2014;54:46-55. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2013.07.010
25. Brondízio ES, Aumeeruddy-Thomas Y, Bates P, et al. Locally based, regionally manifested, and globally relevant: Indigenous and local knowledge, values, and practices for nature. Annu Rev Environ Resour. 2021;46:481-509. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-environ-012220-012127
26. Garnett ST, Burgess ND, Fa JE, et al. A spatial overview of the global importance of Indigenous lands for conservation. Nat Sustain. 2018;1:369-374. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-018-0100-6
27. Petzold J, Andrews N, Ford JD, Hedemann C, Postigo JC. Indigenous knowledge on climate change adaptation: A global evidence map of academic literature. Environ Res Lett. 2020;15(11):113007. https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/abb330
28. Sinthumule NI. Traditional ecological knowledge and its role in biodiversity conservation: A systematic review. Front Environ Sci. 2023;11:1164900. https://doi.org/10.3389/fenvs.2023.1164900
29. Zannini P, Frascaroli F, Nascimbene J, et al. Sacred natural sites and biodiversity conservation: A systematic review. Biodivers Conserv. 2021;30:3747-3762. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10531-021-02296-3

30. Hill R, Adem Ç, Alangui WV, et al. Working with Indigenous, local and scientific knowledge in assessments of nature and nature's linkages with people. Curr Opin Environ Sustain. 2020;43:8-20. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2019.12.006
31. Russell-Smith J, Cook GD, Cooke PM, Edwards AC, Lendrum M, Meyer CP, Whitehead PJ. Managing fire regimes in north Australian savannas: Applying Aboriginal approaches to contemporary global problems. Front Ecol Environ. 2013;11(S1):e55-e63. https://doi.org/10.1890/120251
32. Ikhumetse AA, Abioye OP, Ijah UJJ, Bankole MT. A critical review of oil spills in the Niger Delta aquatic environment: Causes, impacts, and bioremediation assessment. Environ Monit Assess. 2022;194:816. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10661-022-10424-x
33. Ansah CE, Abu I-O, Kleemann J, Mahmoud MI, Thiel M. Environmental contamination of a biodiversity hotspot - Action needed for nature conservation in the Niger Delta, Nigeria. Sustainability. 2022;14(21):14256. https://doi.org/10.3390/su142114256
34. Bamidele S, Erameh NI. Environmental degradation and sustainable peace dialogue in the Niger Delta region of Nigeria. Resour Policy. 2023;80:103274. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resourpol.2022.103274
35. Wiedmann T, Lenzen M, Keyßer LT, Steinberger JK. Scientists' warning on affluence. Nat Commun. 2020;11:3107. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-16941-y
36. Lau WWY, Shiran Y, Bailey RM, et al. Evaluating scenarios toward zero plastic pollution. Science. 2020;369(6510):1455-1461. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aba9475
37. Hayhoe D, Bloom MA, Webb BS. Changing evangelical minds on climate change. Environ Res Lett. 2019;14(2):024016. https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/aaf0ce
38. Ens EJ, Pert P, Clarke PA, et al. Indigenous biocultural knowledge in ecosystem science and management: Review and insight from Australia. Biol Conserv. 2015;181:133-149. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2014.11.008
39. Bowman DMJS, Balch J, Artaxo P, et al. The human dimension of fire regimes on Earth. J Biogeogr. 2011;38(12):2223-2236. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2699.2011.02595.x
40. Altieri MA, Toledo VM. The agroecological revolution in Latin America: Rescuing nature, ensuring food sovereignty and empowering peasants. J Peasant Stud. 2011;38(3):587-612. https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2011.582947
41. Ormerod R. The history and ideas of pragmatism. J Oper Res Soc. 2006;57(8):892-909. https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.jors.2602065

FUNDING

No financing

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

None.

AUTHORSHIP CONTRIBUTIONS

Conceptualization: Ikechukwu Monday Osebor.
Data curation: Ikechukwu Monday Osebor.
Formal analysis: Ikechukwu Monday Osebor.
Investigation: Ikechukwu Monday Osebor.
Methodology: Ikechukwu Monday Osebor.
Supervision: Ikechukwu Monday Osebor.
Validation: Ikechukwu Monday Osebor.
Visualization: Ikechukwu Monday Osebor.
Writing – original draft: Ikechukwu Monday Osebor.
Writing – review and editing: Ikechukwu Monday Osebor.