INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LATEST TECHNOLOGY IN ENGINEERING, MANAGEMENT & APPLIED SCIENCE (IJLTEMAS)

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue I, January 2026

Ancient Indian Ecology and the Modern Climate Crisis: Forgotten Wisdom for a Warming World

Swati Pal

Senior Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, Indraprastha College for Women, Delhi University, Delhi

DOI : https://doi.org/10.51583/IJLTEMAS.2026.150100028

Received: 12 January 2026; Accepted: 17 January 2026; Published: 27 January 2026

Author's Note

This article is an original work authored solely by Ms. Swati Pal. It has not been published previously and is not under consideration by any other journal. All sources have been cited in accordance with APA 7th edition guidelines. Correspondence concerning this article can be addressed to spal@ip.du.ac.in

ABSTRACT

The contemporary climate crisis is often framed as a scientific, technological or economic challenge, yet at its core it reflects a deeper philosophical and civilizational rupture: humanity's loss of ecological consciousness. Ancient Indian ecological thought—expressed through the Vedas, Upanishads, epics, Buddhist and Jain traditions, and classical environmental ethics—offered a view of life grounded in interdependence, restraint, and moral responsibility toward nature. This article re-examines that wisdom not as nostalgia but as a conceptual resource for navigating global warming. It argues that ancient Indian thought recognized ecological limits long before modern sustainability discourse emerged, viewing nature as a living, sacred continuum rather than an inert resource. By exploring principles such as ṛta (cosmic order), ahimsa (non-harm), aparigraha (non-possession), lokasaṃgraha (welfare of all), and prithvi dharma (Earth ethics), this study demonstrates how Indian ecological philosophy provides a moral grammar for climate resilience. The article also analyses how industrial modernity's extractive worldview diverges from these insights, resulting in accelerated ecological collapse. By placing ancient Indian ideas in dialogue with contemporary climate science, environmental justice debates, and global policy failures, the paper shows how this wisdom can enrich climate ethics, inspire alternative development models, and offer a deeply human orientation to planetary survival. The conclusion suggests that the climate crisis is not merely an environmental failure but a civilizational amnesia—and recovering ancient Indian ecological sensibilities may illuminate pathways toward a more sustainable future.

Keywords: Ancient Indian ecology, climate change, environmental ethics, ṛta, ahimsa, sustainability, civilizational wisdom, global warming.

INTRODUCTION

Climate change is widely narrated as a threat emerging from carbon emissions, industrial excesses and unsustainable patterns of development. But beneath these measurable causes lies a profound philosophical crisis: the modern world has forgotten what it means to belong to the Earth. This rupture is not universal; it is rooted in a specific trajectory of Western industrial modernity that declared nature to be inert matter awaiting human conquest. By contrast, ancient Indian civilization was built on an ecological intimacy that permeated its philosophy, culture, rituals, economy and morality. Rivers were mothers, mountains were embodiments of divinity, forests were abodes of knowledge, and life was understood as a continuum shared by humans, animals, and the natural world. This ecological consciousness was not romantic but reflective of a sophisticated understanding of interdependence, restraint, and harmony.

As the world confronts global warming, ecosystem collapse, and biodiversity loss, the insights of ancient Indian ecological thought do not belong to the past—they speak urgently to the present. They remind us that climate

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue I, January 2026

change is not only a technological deficit but a moral failure, not merely a carbon problem but a consciousness problem. Ancient India did not face global warming, but it confronted the perennial question that humanity faces today: how should humans live on Earth without violating its rhythms? This article revisits that question through four major philosophical pillars of classical Indian ecology.

I. Ṛta and Cosmic Order: Reclaiming Balance in a Disequilibrium Age

To understand what ancient Indian ecology can offer a warming world, one must begin with an idea so foundational that it shaped not only ritual imagination but the very grammar of reality in early Indian thought: ṛta. In the Vedic worldview, ṛta is not simply "order" in a mechanical sense. It is the deep rhythm of existence, the lawful harmony through which seasons return, rivers flow, winds move, seeds sprout, and life sustains itself without collapsing into chaos. It is cosmic balance, but also moral balance. The striking feature of this concept is that it dissolves the modern separation between nature and ethics. In the logic of ṛta, the ecological and the ethical are not different domains; they mirror each other. When human conduct violates harmony, nature's equilibrium also shifts, because human life is not outside the cosmos but woven into its fabric. Modern climate science, in its own language, describes a similar truth: human activity is now reshaping atmospheric chemistry, altering ocean circulation, destabilizing monsoon cycles, and pushing ecosystems toward tipping points. Ancient India arrived at this insight without carbon models, because it saw the Earth as a living field of relationships rather than as an inert inventory of resources.

The climate crisis is fundamentally a crisis of disequilibrium. The planet is warming because greenhouse gases trap heat in the atmosphere, disrupting the delicate balance that made stable human civilization possible. But behind the physics lies a philosophy: industrial modernity treats nature as an external object to be subdued and extracted, assuming that human desire has no natural limit. Ṛta challenges that assumption at its root. It says that limits are not restrictions imposed by scarcity; they are conditions of harmony. In this sense, ṛta is not anti-development. It is a warning against development that behaves as if the Earth has no memory and no threshold. The Vedic imagination does not celebrate uncontrolled acquisition; it venerates proportion. This is why Vedic hymns repeatedly invoke the regularity of dawn, the sanctity of water, the generosity of Earth, and the stability of the sky. The cosmos is perceived as a moral order of mutual giving. Humans are beneficiaries of this order, but they are also responsible participants. Climate change, when read through ṛta, appears less like a technical mishap and more like a civilizational breach of reciprocity—an abandonment of the idea that the Earth's rhythms deserve respect.

The ecological relevance of ṛta becomes clearer when we consider how ancient Indian thought connected human excess with cosmic disturbance. While the texts do not speak of "global warming," they repeatedly imply that greed and disorder invite imbalance, drought, scarcity, and suffering. The moral psychology is sophisticated: when desire becomes boundless, consumption becomes violent, and violence toward nature rebounds as instability in the human world. Contemporary environmental scholarship often arrives at a parallel conclusion when it traces how consumer culture and extractive economies amplify ecological breakdown. Yet modern discussions frequently reduce the problem to emissions alone, as if carbon were the only language of ecological harm. Ṛta expands the moral horizon: it insists that any human action that destabilizes harmony—whether through pollution, deforestation, waste, or cruelty toward life—represents a breach of cosmic responsibility. In this view, the climate crisis is not merely a failure of energy policy; it is a failure of relationship. The Earth is not treated as kin but as a quarry.

This is precisely where ancient ecological wisdom can enrich contemporary climate action. Much of modern environmental policy is shaped by what can be called a "managerial" imagination: nature is a system to be regulated, risks are to be managed, and technological solutions must keep economic growth intact. While such frameworks may reduce certain harms, they often fail to transform the underlying worldview that produced the crisis. Ṛta offers a deeper shift because it reconstructs the human position within the cosmos. It encourages a climate ethic based on humility and proportion. It reminds us that stability is not an automatic gift; it is a fragile achievement of balance. The stability of monsoons, glaciers, coastal ecosystems, and biodiversity is not guaranteed if humans behave as if the Earth's capacity to absorb harm is infinite. Modern science now confirms

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue I, January 2026

the same: surpass certain thresholds and the Earth system can enter new, less hospitable states. In the moral language of ṛta, this is what happens when harmony is violated.

The practical implications of such a concept are not merely spiritual. Ṛta can be interpreted as a philosophical foundation for ecological restraint, sustainable living, and climate justice. It invites a culture of moderation where the question is not "How much can we extract?" but "How much is enough?" The climate debate is often framed around efficiency—more output with less carbon. But efficiency alone cannot resolve the crisis if total consumption continues to rise. Ṛta addresses the deeper driver: the ideology of endless expansion. It suggests that a good life is not measured by accumulation but by alignment with a larger rhythm. In this sense, the ancient principle resonates with contemporary calls for redefining prosperity, promoting low-carbon lifestyles, and embracing forms of development that respect ecological limits. Without such a philosophical reorientation, even renewable energy transitions risk becoming new forms of extraction, merely shifting the burden from fossil fuels to minerals, land, and water.

A particularly powerful dimension of ṛta is its invitation to reverence. Reverence here does not mean superstition; it means recognizing that nature is not mute. The Earth responds. Rivers die. Soil exhausts. Air becomes toxic. Climate becomes erratic. When modern life treats these responses as "externalities," it continues the illusion of separateness. Ṛta dissolves that illusion. It frames ecological harm as a disturbance in a shared field of life. This worldview can deepen climate ethics by restoring the idea that the environment is not merely a backdrop to human history but the condition of possibility for every human aspiration. The economy, the state, and the individual psyche all rest upon ecological stability. When stability collapses, everything collapses. Thus, ecological balance is not an environmental issue; it is a civilizational foundation.

Seen this way, climate action requires a renewal of relationship with natural rhythms. It requires learning again how to live with seasons rather than against them, how to design cities that respect heat and water limits, how to farm without exhausting soil and groundwater, and how to measure progress by well-being rather than excess. Ancient Indian ecology does not provide ready-made policy blueprints, but it provides something more enduring: a worldview in which balance is sacred. In a time of climate extremes, this sacredness can translate into an ethic of care, restraint, and responsibility. When humanity treats balance as holy, it becomes less likely to treat the Earth as expendable.

Therefore, ṛta is not merely an ancient term; it is a conceptual lens for reinterpreting the climate crisis as a crisis of harmony. It urges modern societies to shift from domination to participation, from extraction to reciprocity, from speed to stability. The warming world is reminding humanity of a truth that ṛta already contained: nature is not endlessly forgiving, and order is not automatic. If we wish to survive with dignity on this planet, we must re-enter the rhythm of balance—not as a romantic ideal, but as a practical necessity for the future.

II. Ahimsa and Aparigraha: Moral Ecology Beyond the Logic of Endless Growth

If ṛta provides the cosmological framework for ecological balance, ahimsa and aparigraha articulate the ethical discipline required to sustain that balance in everyday human life. These two principles, deeply embedded in Indian philosophical traditions—particularly Jainism, Buddhism, and later Hindu ethical thought—offer a moral ecology that stands in stark contrast to the modern ideology of endless growth. At a time when climate change is accelerating because consumption knows no natural stopping point, these concepts acquire renewed relevance. They do not merely prescribe virtuous behaviour; they interrogate the very psychology that drives environmental destruction.

Ahimsa, commonly translated as non-violence, is often misunderstood as a purely interpersonal ethic. In its deeper philosophical sense, it refers to an attitude of radical sensitivity toward all forms of life. Violence is not limited to physical harm; it includes any action that causes suffering, imbalance, or destruction. From this perspective, large-scale deforestation, the poisoning of rivers, the extinction of species, and the destabilization of climate systems are forms of collective violence—often normalized because they are mediated through markets, machines, and distance. Modern societies rarely experience the consequences of ecological violence directly; they are displaced onto vulnerable communities, future generations, and non-human life. Ahimsa

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue I, January 2026

challenges this moral distancing. It insists that harm does not disappear simply because it is outsourced or delayed.

In the context of global warming, ahimsa offers a profound critique of carbon-intensive lifestyles. Climate change is not an abstract threat; it inflicts suffering through heatwaves, floods, crop failures, displacement, and loss of livelihood. The victims are disproportionately the poor, the indigenous, and those least responsible for emissions. When read through the lens of ahimsa, this asymmetry becomes a moral indictment of the dominant development model. It exposes climate change as a form of structural violence, where comfort in one part of the world is purchased at the cost of survival in another. This ethical framing deepens climate discourse by shifting it from technical management to moral responsibility. It asks not only how emissions can be reduced, but whose suffering is being normalized in the meantime.

Aparigraha, or non-possession, complements ahimsa by addressing the internal engine of ecological violence: desire without restraint. Jain philosophy, in particular, treats excessive accumulation as a form of bondage that enslaves both the possessor and the world around them. Possession beyond need generates attachment, fear of loss, and a constant urge for expansion. In ecological terms, this translates into overconsumption, waste, and relentless extraction. The climate crisis is inseparable from this psychology of excess. Rising global temperatures are not simply the result of population growth or technological lag; they are the consequence of a civilization that equates progress with accumulation.

Modern economic systems institutionalize this mindset. Growth is treated as an unquestionable good, even when it erodes ecological foundations. The pursuit of higher GDP often masks the depletion of soil, water, forests, and atmospheric stability. Aparigraha directly confronts this logic. It does not reject material well-being, but it draws a clear distinction between need and greed. By emphasizing sufficiency rather than abundance, it offers an ethical vocabulary for rethinking development in a climate-constrained world. This resonates strongly with contemporary discussions around sustainable consumption, degrowth, and post-growth economics. Long before these debates entered academic discourse, ancient Indian thinkers recognized that unchecked desire leads to collective ruin.

Together, ahimsa and aparigraha form a moral ecology that is strikingly relevant to climate mitigation and adaptation. They suggest that technological solutions alone cannot address global warming unless they are accompanied by a transformation in values. Renewable energy transitions, for instance, may reduce emissions, but if they are pursued within a culture of limitless consumption, they risk reproducing new forms of ecological harm. Mining for lithium, large-scale land acquisition for solar farms, and the displacement of communities for "green" infrastructure raise ethical questions that technical frameworks often ignore. A moral ecology rooted in non-harm and restraint demands that climate solutions themselves be evaluated for justice and compassion.

These principles also challenge the narrative that individual ethics are irrelevant in the face of systemic problems. While climate change is undeniably a structural issue, ancient Indian thought refuses to separate the structure from the psyche. Systems are sustained by desires, aspirations, and habits of individuals. Aparigraha invites a cultural shift where moderation becomes a collective virtue rather than a personal sacrifice. When restraint is socially valued, policies aimed at reducing emissions encounter less resistance. When excess is glorified, even the best policies falter. In this sense, ancient moral ecology complements modern climate governance by addressing the cultural foundations of compliance and cooperation.

Perhaps the most radical contribution of ahimsa and aparigraha lies in how they redefine human freedom. Modern consumer culture equates freedom with choice and abundance. Ancient Indian ethics redefine freedom as liberation from compulsive desire. In a warming world, this redefinition has transformative implications. A society that finds dignity in simplicity rather than status consumption is better equipped to face ecological limits without social collapse. Such a society can imagine prosperity without planetary destruction.

Ultimately, ahimsa and aparigraha suggest that the climate crisis cannot be solved solely by managing carbon; it must be addressed by reorienting human values. They offer a moral compass that points toward coexistence rather than conquest, sufficiency rather than excess, care rather than exploitation. In a world struggling to

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue I, January 2026

reconcile development with survival, these ancient principles remind us that sustainability begins not in technology or treaties, but in the ethical imagination of humanity itself.

III. Forest Civilizations, River Cultures, and Sacred Geography: Ecological Intimacy as a Way of Life

Ancient Indian ecology was not confined to philosophical texts alone; it was lived, practiced, and spatially embedded in what may be described as forest civilizations and river cultures. Unlike modern societies that separate nature from culture, ancient Indian life unfolded within nature as an intimate participant. Forests, rivers, mountains, animals, and seasons were not peripheral to human existence but central to its meaning. This ecological intimacy shaped modes of knowledge, social organization, spiritual practice, and economic life. In the context of the contemporary climate crisis, this civilizational relationship with nature offers a radically different imagination—one that contrasts sharply with modern extractive and technocratic approaches.

The forest occupies a particularly significant place in ancient Indian thought. Far from being seen as wilderness to be conquered, forests were regarded as spaces of learning, contemplation, and moral refinement. The Aranyakas, literally "forest texts," emerged from a recognition that certain kinds of knowledge could only be cultivated in close proximity to nature. The forest was a teacher in its own right, training the human mind in patience, attentiveness, and humility. Living among trees and animals fostered an awareness of interdependence, reminding humans that survival depended on restraint and respect rather than domination. This worldview stands in stark contrast to the modern tendency to view forests primarily as carbon sinks, timber reserves, or land banks for development. While contemporary environmental discourse often reduces forests to their instrumental value, ancient Indian ecology understood them as living communities that shaped ethical consciousness.

River cultures further illustrate this deep ecological embeddedness. Rivers such as the Ganga, Yamuna, Saraswati, Godavari, and Narmada were not merely sources of water; they were revered as mothers and guardians of life. Settlements evolved around rivers not only for agriculture but for cultural and spiritual sustenance. Seasonal rhythms, festivals, and social practices aligned themselves with river cycles, cultivating an attunement to ecological patterns. This relational approach contrasts with the modern engineering mindset that seeks to control rivers through dams, diversions, and concrete embankments, often with disastrous ecological consequences. Climate change has amplified the fragility of river systems, making floods more destructive and droughts more prolonged. Ancient river cultures, by contrast, adapted to variability rather than attempting to dominate it. They recognized that rivers had moods, limits, and agency—an insight that contemporary water governance is only beginning to rediscover.

Sacred geography provided the ethical glue that held this ecological intimacy together. Mountains were not inert landforms but abodes of divinity; animals were carriers of moral symbolism; trees were objects of reverence; the Earth herself was invoked as Bhumi Devi. This sacralization did not imply irrational worship but cultivated restraint. When landscapes are sacred, exploitation becomes a moral transgression rather than a mere regulatory violation. The modern climate crisis reveals the cost of desacralization. Once nature is stripped of symbolic value, it becomes infinitely exploitable. Sacred geography functioned as a cultural technology that limited human excess by embedding ecological respect into everyday consciousness.

The erosion of this worldview has been gradual but profound. Colonial modernity introduced a sharp rupture by redefining land as property, forests as revenue-generating assets, and rivers as infrastructure. This shift continued into postcolonial development trajectories that prioritized industrial growth over ecological continuity. As a result, contemporary India faces severe environmental challenges—deforestation, groundwater depletion, polluted rivers, and climate-induced agricultural stress. These crises are often addressed through policy instruments, but without restoring ecological intimacy, such measures remain partial and fragile. Ancient Indian ecology suggests that environmental sustainability cannot be sustained by law and technology alone; it requires a cultural relationship with nature that shapes values, desires, and everyday practices.

Importantly, forest and river cultures also fostered social ethics of coexistence. Communities living close to nature developed systems of collective responsibility, recognizing that individual excess could harm the entire ecosystem. This sensibility is largely absent in modern urban life, where consumption is disconnected from

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue I, January 2026

ecological consequences. Climate change has exposed this disconnection on a planetary scale. Emissions generated in one region disrupt lives thousands of kilometres away. Ancient Indian ecological thought anticipated this interdependence at a local level, cultivating a moral imagination capable of understanding shared vulnerability.

Revisiting these civilizational patterns does not mean romanticizing the past or advocating a return to pre-modern lifestyles. Rather, it means recovering the orientation that saw nature as a partner rather than a warehouse. Forest-based learning, river-sensitive planning, and sacred geographies can inform contemporary climate strategies by restoring ecological literacy and emotional connection to the Earth. When people feel connected to landscapes, they are more willing to protect them. When nature is reduced to data, protection becomes abstract and negotiable.

In a warming world, where climate impacts increasingly disrupt human settlements, the ancient Indian emphasis on ecological intimacy offers a corrective to the alienation that defines modern life. It reminds us that survival depends not only on adaptation technologies but on reweaving the bonds between humans and their environments. Forest civilizations and river cultures represent not obsolete histories but alternative futures—futures where human flourishing is inseparable from ecological harmony.

IV. Dharma, Responsibility, and Planetary Survival: Reclaiming Ethics in a Climate-Stressed World

The final and perhaps most integrative pillar of ancient Indian ecological thought is the concept of dharma. Often translated as duty, law, or righteousness, dharma in its deeper philosophical sense signifies the sustaining principle of life itself. It is the moral force that holds together the individual, society, and cosmos in a relationship of mutual responsibility. In ecological terms, dharma functions as an ethical framework that defines how humans ought to live within the limits and rhythms of the Earth. At a moment when climate change threatens planetary stability, this ancient concept offers a profound rethinking of responsibility that goes beyond modern legalistic or technocratic approaches.

In classical Indian thought, dharma is inseparable from context. One's responsibilities are shaped by one's position within the web of life. Kings were expected to protect forests, ensure sustainable use of land and water, prevent cruelty to animals, and safeguard the livelihoods of cultivators. The Arthashastra contains detailed instructions on forest conservation, wildlife protection, and water management, recognizing that ecological stability underpinned political stability. Environmental destruction was not treated as an external cost but as a failure of governance. This holistic understanding resonates strongly with contemporary climate science, which demonstrates that ecological collapse undermines food security, public health, and social cohesion. Long before climate models made these connections explicit, ancient Indian thought recognized that the fate of society is inseparable from the fate of nature.

The relevance of dharma becomes especially clear when examining the modern climate crisis through the lens of responsibility. Contemporary climate debates often revolve around emissions targets, technological innovation, and market mechanisms. While necessary, these approaches frequently obscure the ethical dimension of climate change. Who bears responsibility for historical emissions? Who suffers the consequences? Who has the capacity to adapt, and who does not? Dharma reframes these questions by insisting that responsibility cannot be detached from power. Those who benefit most from ecological exploitation bear the greatest moral obligation to protect and restore balance. This perspective aligns closely with principles of climate justice, which argue that wealthy nations and elites must assume a disproportionate share of mitigation and adaptation efforts.

Unlike modern notions of responsibility that are often contractual and transactional, dharma is relational. It recognizes that humans owe obligations not only to other humans but to non-human life and future generations. This intergenerational dimension is particularly relevant in the context of global warming, where today's actions will shape the conditions of life for centuries. Ancient Indian texts repeatedly emphasize continuity across time, reminding humans that short-term gain at the cost of long-term harmony constitutes a moral failure. Climate

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue I, January 2026

change, when viewed through this lens, appears as a violation of temporal responsibility—a refusal to honour obligations to those yet unborn.

Dharma also dissolves the false opposition between individual and collective action. Modern climate discourse often oscillates between blaming individual lifestyles and emphasizing systemic change. Ancient Indian ethics refuse this dichotomy. Individual conduct and social order are seen as mutually reinforcing. A society cannot be just if individuals act without restraint, and individuals cannot flourish if society is unjust. Applied to climate change, this means that personal consumption choices, corporate practices, and state policies are all ethically significant. Structural reform is essential, but it must be accompanied by a transformation in values and consciousness. Without this, policies remain superficial and vulnerable to reversal.

Perhaps the most transformative contribution of dharma lies in how it reframes the purpose of development. Modern development models prioritize economic growth, often assuming that environmental harm can be mitigated later through technological fixes. Dharma challenges this linear logic. It insists that means and ends cannot be separated: a path that destroys ecological foundations cannot lead to genuine well-being. True prosperity, from this perspective, is measured not by accumulation but by harmony. In a climate-stressed world, this redefinition is crucial. It opens space for development pathways that prioritize resilience, community, and ecological regeneration over short-term profit.

Reclaiming ecological dharma does not require abandoning modern science or innovation. Rather, it demands integrating ethical reflection into technological decision-making. Climate solutions such as renewable energy, urban expansion, or geoengineering must be evaluated not only for efficiency but for their impact on ecosystems, communities, and future generations. Dharma provides a moral compass for navigating these complex choices, reminding humanity that power without responsibility leads to collapse. In this sense, ancient Indian ecological ethics do not oppose modernity; they seek to humanize it.

As climate change intensifies, the limits of purely technical solutions become increasingly apparent. Rising temperatures, extreme weather events, and ecological disruptions reveal a deeper crisis of meaning and responsibility. Dharma speaks directly to this crisis. It calls for a reawakening of ethical consciousness that recognizes the Earth not as a commodity but as a shared moral horizon. Planetary survival, from this perspective, is not only a scientific challenge but a test of humanity's moral maturity.

In the end, the ancient Indian vision of dharma offers a sobering yet hopeful message. It suggests that the climate crisis is not inevitable; it is the outcome of choices rooted in ignorance and imbalance. By recovering an ethic of responsibility grounded in interdependence, restraint, and reverence for life, humanity can still chart a different course. In a warming world searching for guidance, dharma reminds us that survival is not secured by domination, but by duty—duty to the Earth, to each other, and to the fragile future we all share.

CONCLUSION

The accelerating climate crisis has exposed the limits of contemporary environmental thinking that relies primarily on technological innovation and policy instruments while leaving deeper ethical questions unaddressed. Rising temperatures, collapsing ecosystems, and widening climate inequalities signal not only an environmental emergency but a civilizational rupture in humanity's relationship with the Earth. In this context, ancient Indian ecological thought does not offer nostalgic retreat into the past; it offers conceptual clarity for the future. Its enduring relevance lies in its ability to reframe climate change as a crisis of balance, restraint, and responsibility rather than merely a crisis of carbon management.

By revisiting ideas such as ṛta, ahimsa, aparigraha, sacred geography, and dharma, this article has shown that ancient Indian civilization articulated an ecological worldview grounded in interdependence and moral accountability. These concepts collectively reject the modern assumption that nature exists solely for human use. Instead, they position humanity as a participant within a living ecological order whose stability depends on reciprocal care. When interpreted alongside contemporary climate science, these ideas illuminate the deeper roots of global warming in unchecked consumption, moral disengagement, and the erosion of ecological

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue I, January 2026

intimacy. Climate change thus emerges not as an unforeseen consequence of progress, but as the predictable outcome of a worldview that severed ethics from ecology.

The strength of ancient Indian ecological wisdom lies in its integration of inner transformation with external action. It recognizes that sustainable futures cannot be built solely through institutional reforms if human desires remain unexamined and unrestrained. Ahimsa reminds us that environmental harm is a form of violence, often inflicted on the most vulnerable, while aparigraha challenges the growth-driven logic that equates well-being with accumulation. Sacred geography restores reverence to landscapes, making exploitation morally unthinkable rather than merely illegal. Dharma, finally, offers a comprehensive ethical framework that binds individual conduct, governance, and intergenerational responsibility into a single moral vision.

As the world confronts irreversible climatic thresholds, these insights acquire urgent relevance. They encourage a shift from domination to stewardship, from entitlement to responsibility, and from short-term gain to long-term harmony. Ancient Indian ecology does not claim to replace modern science or policy; rather, it complements them by restoring the ethical foundations without which technical solutions remain fragile. The climate crisis ultimately demands more than innovation—it demands wisdom. In recovering the ecological sensibilities embedded in ancient Indian thought, humanity may yet rediscover how to live within planetary limits while preserving dignity, justice, and the possibility of a shared future on a warming Earth.

REFERENCES

1. Agarwal, A., & Narain, S. (1991). Global warming in an unequal world: A case of environmental colonialism. Centre for Science and Environment.
2. Aurobindo, S. (1998). The human cycle. Sri Aurobindo Ashram Press. (Original work published 1916)
3. Bhagavad Gita. (2008). The Bhagavad Gita (S. Radhakrishnan, Trans.). HarperCollins. (Original work composed ca. 2nd century BCE)
4. Carson, R. (1962). Silent spring. Houghton Mifflin.
5. Chakrabarty, D. (2009). The climate of history: Four theses. Critical Inquiry, 35(2), 197–222. https://doi.org/10.1086/596640
6. Daly, H. E. (1996). Beyond growth: The economics of sustainable development. Beacon Press.
7. Gadgil, M., & Guha, R. (1995). Ecology and equity: The use and abuse of nature in contemporary India. Penguin Books.
8. Guha, R. (2000). Environmentalism: A global history. Longman.
9. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. (2023). Climate change 2023: Synthesis report. IPCC. https://www.ipcc.ch
10. Jain, L. C. (2011). Ahimsa and ecology in Jain philosophy. Motilal Banarsidass.
11. Kautilya. (2013). The Arthashastra (R. Shamasastry, Trans.). Penguin Classics. (Original work composed ca. 3rd century BCE)
12. Nussbaum, M. C. (2011). Creating capabilities: The human development approach. Harvard University Press.
13. Shiva, V. (1988). Staying alive: Women, ecology and development. Zed Books.
14. Shiva, V. (2005). Earth democracy: Justice, sustainability, and peace. Zed Books.
15. Upanishads. (2003). The principal Upanishads (S. Radhakrishnan, Trans.). HarperCollins. (Original works composed ca. 800–200 BCE)
16. World Commission on Environment and Development. (1987). Our common future. Oxford University Press.