



## Rejecting Extractivism and Embracing Reciprocity: A Christian Environmental Ethic in *Paradise Lost*

Emma Lassen  
Coe College

Emma Lassen is a 2023 graduate of Coe College in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, where she studied English, social and criminal justice, and secondary education. She is always looking for ways to merge her various interests. Outside of academics, Emma competed for the Coe women's tennis team for four years. She also worked at her College's writing center and as a supplemental instruction leader for social and criminal justice classes. Emma plans to teach middle or high school English/language arts to share her love of reading and writing with young people. Emma would especially like to extend her thanks to Professor Gina Hausknecht for her encouragement and support of this project and many others.

### Abstract

*Extractivism refers to the removal of natural resources from the Earth and the exploitation of the physical environment for personal gain. Because the activity and the mindset of extractivism are major contributors to human-caused climate change, a cultural shift away from extractivism is an important step towards protecting the planet. My article will demonstrate how John Milton's epic poem, Paradise Lost, establishes an environmental ethic that urges humans to see themselves as deeply connected to their physical world and as stewards of the Earth's resources. I first consider how Milton aligns Satan and the fallen angels with an extractivist mindset. I then discuss how Milton's interpretation of Genesis I and II help him develop God in his poem as an anti-extractivist character who instructs Adam and Eve in how best to interact with their environment. Finally, I argue that Milton asks his readers to consider what a non-extractivist relationship with the environment looks like, presenting a reciprocal relationship between Adam and Eve and the natural world. While Milton's writing of Paradise Lost predates our modern understanding of climate change, it can offer humans living on the planet today a different way to approach climate solutions.*

If we approach nature and the environment without this openness to awe and wonder, if we no longer speak the language of fraternity and beauty in our relationship with the world, our attitude will be that of masters, consumers, ruthless exploiters, unable to set limits on their immediate needs. By contrast, if we feel intimately united with all that exists, then sobriety and care will well up spontaneously. (Francis)

Record breaking heat waves in the summer, life-threatening temperature lows in the winters, and unprecedented tropical storms ravaging coastlines and islands: The world has been feeling the impacts of climate change in increasingly frequent and destructive ways. While this is still a controversial fact in some circles, the global climate crisis has recently been receiving attention from scientists and politicians across the world who are working to come up with solutions to ensure that our planet continues to sustain human life long into the future. These efforts are largely focused on mitigating the effects of climate change—for example, creating better infrastructure to protect coastal communities from hurricanes—or on developing technology to lessen the reliance on fossil fuels. In the midst of these discussions, consideration of the societal and cultural attitudes that are the driving forces behind human-caused climate change can offer valuable guidance as to the path forward. Extractivism, a relatively new term, succinctly identifies both extractive physical activities and the related cultural attitudes, which have contributed to global warming for centuries. The action of extractivism refers to the removal of resources from the Earth at a rate that far exceeds the ability for the resources to replenish naturally and retain a state of equilibrium. However, because extractivism is “based on socio-ecologically destructive processes of subjugation, depletion, and non-reciprocal relations,” it does not simply define a physical action (Chagnon, et al. 762). Extractivism as an activity can easily lead to an extractivist mindset, which regards not only land and natural resources but animals, plants, and even people as resources to be used for personal gain. Several hallmarks of the current Western capitalistic society—a focus on short-term goals and deadlines as opposed to long-term sustainability, as well as a prioritization of efficiency and productivity—are rooted in extractivism. Extractivism as a mindset prioritizes one’s immediate wants or needs over the well-being of other life or planet-wide health and happiness. Because extractivism is central to many economic and social structures of the Western world, any discussions surrounding climate change are incomplete without considering its tight grip on global markets, politics, and cultures.

Climate solutions, then, are also incomplete without considering how to challenge and ultimately replace the pervasive extractivist mindset. However, because of the ubiquity of extractivism, it can be difficult to imagine what a world without extractivism would look like. How should humans interact with their environments? What responsibility, if any, do humans have for the

non-human creatures they share their planet with? Despite pre-dating both the modern understanding of climate change and extractivism, John Milton explored these very questions in his epic poem *Paradise Lost* over 350 years ago. Milton presents characters who operate both inside and outside of an extractivist mindset; he explores extractivism and its perils through Satan and the other fallen angels, while he uses Adam and Eve's life in prelapsarian Eden to show what a harmonious, globally beneficial relationship with the living world could look like. By showing extractivism to be associated with disobedience to God and misalignment with His will, Milton offers a distinctly Christian environmental ethic that prioritizes reciprocity and mutual care among humans, the land, and all creatures. This paper will first explore Milton's representation of extractivism through Satan, the fallen angels, and the moments leading up to the Fall. It will then consider how Milton's interpretation of Genesis I and II formulated God's environmental ethic in the poem before exploring the actions and attitudes Milton attributes to a healthy, reciprocal relationship between humankind and the rest of the planet.

### **Extractivism: Satan and the Fallen Angels**

Perhaps the most evocative lines regarding the extractivist nature of Satan and the fallen angels comes in Book 1, lines 684–92, during the construction of Pandemonium. The fallen angels have recently been cast out of Heaven and are acclimating to life in Hell by reshaping the environment in which they have found themselves. The fallen angels engage in mining and extraction of precious metals from the core of Hell, and Milton's use of figurative language in this section makes the immorality of their actions clear. He does not simply write that the fallen angels dig into the Earth and take out gold; Milton writes instead that they have “Opened into the hill a spacious wound / And digged out ribs of gold” (1.689–90). As scholar Sarah Smith notes, Milton presents mining as “an act of bodily violation and desecration . . . in no uncertain terms” (45). Here, the mined land is described as wounded by mining and the extracted precious metal as a part of a body. This connection between interpersonal violence and mining is not incidental, as we see Milton use similar language rebuking humankind's own mining of the Earth. Milton warns that “Men also, and by his [the fallen angel Mammon's] suggestion taught, / Ransacked the center, and with impious hands / Rifled the bowels of their mother earth / For treasures better hid” (1.685–88). Milton implicates his modern audience in this form of environmental destruction, and thus the bodily violation that he is associating with it. Milton's alliteration in these lines draws attention to two verbs of violation—“ransacked” and “rifled”—both of which evoke images of a burglary or theft in which precious belongings are recklessly pilfered. Additionally, Milton makes it clear *how* the fallen angels are interacting with the land: without any reverence or appreciation for the resources it is providing to them. The fallen angels use “impious hands” when they are mining, solidifying that this is a violating act done with no regard

for the land itself or the God who created it. This section of the text clearly establishes the action of mining—importantly, whether being done by fallen angels or humans in Milton’s own time—as one of extractivism. There is an utter disregard for the needs of the land, and the focus is entirely on what can be taken; in this case, of course, it is “treasures better hid” and “ribs of gold.” Additionally, by representing the violated land as not inanimate but living and with an anatomy not unlike a person, Milton creates an uncomfortable space for his readers to consider the morality of this type of violation.

It is important to note that the fallen angels are not engaging in mining for the sake of destruction alone. They create Pandemonium from the resources they have extracted, an ambitious project for the citizens of a new place to undertake. Despite the positive outcomes generally associated with the idea of creation, Milton is clear about the negative implications of mining, even for industrious purposes. He tells “those / Who boast in mortal things, and wond’ring tell / Of Babel” to “Learn how their greatest monuments of fame, / And strength and art are easily outdone/By spirits reprobate” (1.692–97). In the Biblical story of the Tower of Babel, humankind undertakes the building of a tower that reaches Heaven. God punishes this sinful pride by spreading humanity out around the Earth and introducing many languages (Genesis 11.1–7). The building of the Tower of Babel can be seen as a cautionary tale about not attempting to make yourself equal with God. According to Milton, this hubristic endeavor is “easily outdone / By spirits reprobate” as they are building their palace in Hell (1. 696–97). This allusion demonstrates that not all creation is considered morally good work because, as Smith notes, “matter can be implicated in sinful acts” even when the matter itself has had nothing to do with the sinful arrangement it has undergone (40). That the mining in Hell was used for the purpose of creation does not excuse environmental destruction and instead provides further evidence that Satan and the fallen angels can be read as extractivist characters. The fallen angels take God’s creation and rearrange it to fit their own purposes; this is important because “Milton presents acts of rearranging matter—in particular, the ventures undertaken by the rebel angels—as acts of disobedience” (Smith 44). The extraction is misaligned with God’s will for the resources, which alone is enough to demonstrate the sinfulness of extractivism. Much like the constructors of the Tower of Babel to which they are compared, the “impious hands” that mine to build Pandemonium are irreverent and self-interested in their endeavors, instead of glorifying God through creation.

In *Paradise Lost*, the most heroic characters are those who are obedient to God’s will and align their own with His. The fallen angels may be building a palace in Hell, but they are not treated as heroes by Milton. This is because, as Smith argues, any type of creation, or reformation of existing matter in *Paradise Lost* should be seen as a “deeply moral issue,” because it presents characters with the opportunity to either align their work with God’s will or oppose it (44). When the fallen angels reform matter in Hell through their mining, this

creation is a “perversion of divine creation” (Smith 45). Satan’s entire character is shown to be wholly opposed to God’s divine creation through his dedication of himself in Book 9 to complete destruction. He chastises himself for losing sight of what brought him to Eden: “Hate, not love, nor hope / Of Paradise for hell . . . but all pleasure to destroy / Save what is in destroying; other joy / To me is lost” (9.475–79). Milton portrays Satan as completely immersed in the extractivist mindset, a “grasping human subject, eager to exert mastery over the world around him” (Remien 818). Despite knowing and recognizing the beauty of God’s creation time and time again—he is moved to “grief” when he sees how “little inferior” humans are to “heavenly spirits bright,” for example, and he is rendered “[s]tupidly good, of enmity disarmed” by Eve’s loveliness before the Fall—he continually chooses to pursue a selfish goal of destruction (9.358–62). By attributing an extractivist mindset to a character whose primary motivation is to destroy God’s creation, Milton shows such a mindset to be entirely misaligned with God’s will.

### ***Extractivism and the Fall***

The extractivist mindset that Milton attributes to the fallen angels can apply not only to the physical world but to knowledge and understanding, as well. This subset of extractivism can be considered an extraction of knowledge, which can be perilous when it prioritizes scientific understanding of the natural world over its well-being. Environmental scholars draw connections between this type of extractivism and the emergence of mind-body dualism from the work of French philosopher and scientist René Descartes, which gives precedence to a person’s thinking mind over all other aspects of their being, including physical. Cartesian dualism distinguishes humanity from other animals by emphasizing the ability of humans to reason and use science to understand the world around them; it is a belief that “reason fundamentally separates humankind from the rest of the creation” (Remien 821).

Milton shows God to be opposed to this type of scientific extractivism by explicitly demonstrating that humans in his epic poem are not meant to know everything. This is not necessarily intuitive; reason is very important to God, as well as to Adam and Eve, throughout *Paradise Lost*. Almost immediately before the Fall, for example, Eve corrects Satan as the serpent by telling him that she and Adam “live / Law to ourselves; our reason is our law” (9.653–54). At the same time, however, God intends for not all mysteries of the natural world to be explainable to Adam and Eve. Raphael tells Adam that God “Did wisely to conceal and not divulge / His secrets to be scanned by them who ought / Rather admire” and charges him not to ponder things that are outside of his realm of understanding but instead to “be lowly wise” (8.73–74 and 8.173). Jeffery Theis, who comfortably navigates many of Milton’s apparent contradictions as he presents an environmental ethic through *Paradise Lost*, suggests that “in the act of a person’s observing and interpreting nature’s signs through dressing and

keeping, nature can be read and can impart knowledge” (68). When humanity seeks knowledge outside the realm of “visible nature,” such seeking is no longer helpful in “developing a worshipful environmental ethic” (70). It is this pursuit of knowledge, specifically, that Milton condemns through Raphael as extractivist, because it no longer focuses on cultivating a harmonious relationship with the non-human, natural world. Remien, who writes about the protective power of wonder in Eden, argues that Milton is “open to forms of experience that subvert the human’s ability fully to comprehend the mysteries of the universe through reason,” thereby making his characters less reliant on Cartesian dualism (821). Milton’s God does not intend for humans to understand everything about their natural world but instead to be content caring for and wondering at its beauty, while an extractivist mindset promotes knowledge and progress irrespective of the cost to planet-wide health.

Satan’s persuasive argument to Eve to incite her Fall demonstrates how this more intellectual form of extractivism can occur. Although he tries multiple unsuccessful tactics first, Satan’s argument for the pursuit of knowledge, laid out logically, is extremely effective in convincing Eve to eat the forbidden fruit. Satan begins his most persuasive argument by calling the tree “Mother of science” and claiming to “feel thy power / Within me clear not only to discern / Things in their causes but to trace the ways / Of highest agents deemed however wise” (9.680–83). In Satan’s account of the world, the tree is worthy of praise not because it is a wondrous creation of God’s but because it is the Mother of science and allows for discernment and wisdom. Satan continues to distance himself from God by encouraging Eve to embrace a scientific ethic that is a perversion of Raphael’s instruction in Book 8. He twists Raphael’s instructions, to “be lowly wise,” into something to be avoided, saying that God has forbidden this fruit from humankind in order “to keep ye low and ignorant, / His worshippers” (9.704–05). Milton is showing how extractivism, when applied to knowledge and understanding, perpetuates a mindset of unencumbered consumption. Eve, in her monologue directly prior to eating the fruit, concludes that any prohibitions on learning and acquiring knowledge “bind not” (9.760). She is simultaneously rejecting all rules that prevent any type of learning, as well as God’s sovereign will.

Milton finally connects the extractivist mindset of the Fall to physical extractivism; when Eve eats the fruit, “Greedily she engorged without restraint” (9.790). Despite beauty being generally associated with Eve throughout the poem, Milton chooses words in this moment that present her in an unattractive light. The word “engorged” is a physical descriptor that brings to mind something swollen or bloated, while “greedily” and “without restraint” point to moral imperfection and directly relate it to an extractivist mindset. Eve, when breaking God’s one rule for humanity, is satisfied only “at length,” and is represented as drunkenly consuming more than she needs (9.792). Through suggesting physical unsightliness in Eve during this moment, as well as using language that describes

her as morally blemished through her lack of restraint, Milton paints a damning picture of Eve as she embraces extractivism in the moments leading up to and after the Fall. Eve finds herself in this position due to her desire for knowledge that God has prohibited, and this type of extractivism is something Milton encourages his readers to find morally and physically repugnant.

### God's Environmental Ethic

In both *Paradise Lost* and the Bible, God gives humankind specific instructions on how they are to interact with nature and the non-human world. At two separate points in the poem, Milton describes the creation of the universe and humanity. These two creation narratives, told by Raphael first and Adam second in Books 7 and 8, respectively, contain God's most direct instructions for humankind's relationship with the environment. Milton uses language identical to Genesis I and II in these passages when describing God's instructions to the humans. In Book 7, Raphael echoes the Genesis I language. In the King James Version of the Bible, God instructs the newly created humans to "replenish the earth, and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth" (Genesis 1.28b). Raphael, likewise, recounts that God told Adam and Eve to "fill the earth, / Subdue it, and, throughout, dominion hold / Over fish of the sea and fowl of the air / And every living thing that moves on the earth" (7.531–34). However, this is not the only instruction God gives to humankind. In both the Bible and *Paradise Lost*, there is a second creation narrative that uses different language to describe God's charge to the newly formed humans. In Genesis II, "the LORD God took the man, and put him into the garden of Eden to dress it and to keep it" (Genesis 2.15). Likewise, when Adam recounts his own memory of his creation, he tells Raphael that God told him "This Paradise I give thee; count it thine / To till and keep" (7.319–20). Milton chooses in these moments to follow the language of the Bible very closely, to the point of including both of these versions of the creation narrative in his epic poem, despite the apparent contradictions these different accounts may present. Did God intend for humans to rule over the garden and to have dominion over the other living creatures, or did he want them to care for the garden by dressing and keeping it? And do these different versions change the environmental ethic that God passed on to the original humans?

Because Milton is attempting to "justify the ways of God to men," this consideration of how God wants humankind to interact with life in Eden is of the utmost importance in understanding Milton's own environmental perspective (1.26). This accounts for various interpretations of Genesis I and II by other writers and philosophers, showing how Milton aligns or diverts from them. He posits that many prominent writers before Milton, including Thomas Aquinas, emphasized "the dissonant tenor of the first chapter of Genesis over the harmonious aspects of chapter ii" (65). This claims that Milton himself, however, is trying to "create a more benign representation of mastership" by showing



Adam and Eve carrying out environmental responsibilities before the Fall (65). Part of what makes Milton's epic so ambitious is the amount of time in his poem that he devotes to representing events in Eden that are not even alluded to in the Bible. While much of God's instructions to Adam and Eve about the natural world in *Paradise Lost* are paraphrased from Genesis I and II, Milton dedicates more time throughout the poem to inventing activities and conversations that have no Biblical source at all. It is in many of these conversations and activities that Milton makes it clear that God desires for humans to interact in a meaningful way with their environment: "Within this temporal and natural space, Adam and Eve are depicted at work tilling and keeping Eden" (Theis 68). God's intentions for humanity were not to take from the Earth without caring for it in turn, even prior to the Fall. Having dominion over the Earth, then, should not be seen as an endorsement by God of an extractivist mindset.

In fact, God may not be encouraging a modern reading of "dominion" at all; Ken Hiltner notes that while the word "dominion" "does derive from the Latin *domus* (which is simply a house—hence 'domicile'), it has been suggested that it may also have a root in the Greek *demein*, which is 'to build'" (25). Therefore, Hiltner suggests, God's instructions to humanity to have dominion over the Earth should not be interpreted as His giving humanity complete control over all other life but instead may be seen as encouragement for them to build a home *with* the other life in Eden (26). Instead of simply reconciling what may first seem to be contradictory instructions to humankind in Genesis I and II, this interpretation firmly distinguishes God's environmental ethic from an extractivist mindset. Indeed, God's one rule for Adam and Eve in Eden—that one tree remains off limits to them for consumption—demonstrates a check imposed on a mindset rooted in uncontrolled taking. God does not, in fact, give humanity unimpeded rule over all life in Eden, because there is a plant they are not to eat from. By disrupting the hierarchy that allows human life and needs to take precedence over all other life, Milton represents a God who asks humans to seek partnership with the land and non-human creatures, instead of lordship over them.

Remien argues that beauty—Eden, in *Paradise Lost*—evokes wonder, which delays destructive action and eventually transitions to inspiring preservation of the object of wonder. Environmental wonder "leads from total immersion in present sensory experience to a consideration of futurity" (Remien 823). This line of reasoning can be expanded by drawing the explicit connection between the preservation Remien is discussing and God's original instructions to Adam and Eve to "keep" the land they were given. In Theis's exploration of the language of Genesis I and II in Hebrew, he notes that "'to keep' nature... requires man to protect nature from any sort of danger" (64). Whether it is Remien's preservation or Theis's protection, it is clear that God intended for Adam and Eve to take care of the natural world around them. "The garden that needs protecting is the garden that has intrinsic worth," and when this is the case, destroying it for personal gain is unthinkable (Theis 64). One cannot engage in



the type of extraction that the fallen angels do in Book 1 if one believes that the natural world has inherent value. By understanding the connection between his original commandments to Adam to till and to keep the land and to assure the preservation of natural beauty, readers can begin to understand what kind of mindset God favors over extractivism.

### *Milton's Alternative to Extractivism: Care and Reciprocity*

As Diane McColley notes, Milton's epic "opposes dualism and the appropriative objectification of nature" in favor of "represent[ing] the kinship and reciprocity of human beings and other beings" (131). By aligning his God with responsibility to the Earth and building reciprocal relationships with its non-human inhabitants, Milton shows a form of Christianity that is antithetical to extractivism. We see Adam and Eve living out this reciprocal relationship with nature in their prelapsarian life in Eden. Their work in the garden is certainly a form of labor, but it is beneficial to both the environment and themselves. When asking Eve to prepare food for Raphael's arrival in Eden, Adam reminds her that "nature...by disburdening grows / More fruitful, which instructs us not to spare" (5.319–20). This is a successful demonstration of a reciprocal relationship; Adam and Eve benefit when food is harvested to satiate their hunger, but the plants benefit from this form of pruning, as well. Eve, however, in her response, reveals even more about a proper relationship with the land: "Small store will serve," she says, "where store, / All seasons, ripe for use hangs on the stalk, / Save what by frugal storing firmness gains" (5.322–24). Adam establishes humankind's role in the relationship between them and the land: they help the plants to produce an abundance of food by pruning them and collecting food to make room for new growth. Eve's response demonstrates how the original humans avoided extractivism while carrying out their responsibilities as gardeners: She reminds Adam not to collect more than they can eat, and that it would be wasteful to store more than is absolutely necessary since they have access to the garden at all times. Adam shows how human activity can contribute to a reciprocal relationship between humankind and plants, and Eve cautions against treating pruning as a form of extractivism by practicing frugality and restraint when harvesting.

Crucially, a reciprocal relationship based on mutual care within one's ecosystem is not reserved in *Paradise Lost* for prelapsarian life. The land continues to provide for Adam and Eve after the Fall. At the moment of Eve's sin, Milton writes that "Earth felt the wound" (9.782) and after Adam also sins, "nature gave a second groan; / Sky loured and, muttering thunder, some sad drops / Wept at completing of the mortal sin/Original" (9.1001–004). These notes that "though wounded, nature is still one of the books of wisdom that, if Adam and Eve cared to read it, would indicate the failure of their ethic" (78). Adam and Eve's environment continues to point them towards God and His will, even though they are choosing to ignore its warning in that moment. Later, however,

we see human concern and care for non-human creatures continue after the Fall as well. Adam, after being shown sin in its many different forms by Michael, takes hope in the image of Noah and the Ark. He rejoices “at this last sight” because he “is assured that man shall live / With all the creatures and their seed preserve” (11.872–73). By witnessing Noah’s care and responsibility towards all the animals on the ark, Adam is seeing the continuation of the environmental ethic he was instructed by God to follow in Eden.

For Eve, the relationship to the garden of Eden goes beyond just reciprocity; there is kinship and even shared identity between her and the land and plants. Leaving Paradise, for Eve, is an “unexpected stroke, worse than of death” (11.268). She worries about herself—“How shall I part, and whither wander down / Into a lower world, to this obscure / And wild?”—but she also worries for the flowers: “Who now shall rear ye to the sun, or rank / Your tribes, and water from the ambrosial fount?” (11.282–85 and 11.277–79). Her horror at having to leave her “native soil” is a combination of fears. She is worried about how she and Adam will survive in a foreign place without the knowledge and relationship of the land they have developed, but she also shows a deep concern for the plants that she has cared for while in Eden. Eve’s lament at having to leave Eden reads less like an individual moving to a new climate and more like a person reckoning with the loss of a significant personal relationship. The interdependence depicted by Eve’s concern for both herself and Adam as well as the ecosystem they are leaving behind shows that reciprocity is still at the forefront of humanity’s relationship with their environment, even after the Fall.

Michael’s response to Eve reveals yet another aspect of humankind’s relationship to their environment. He encourages Eve not to “set thy heart, / Thus overfond, on that which is not thine” (11.288–89). Though much shorter than Eve’s despondent monologue before, Michael offers a powerful reminder to Eve about *why* a caring relationship with land, plants, and non-human creatures is necessary. The inherent value of the place comes from its belonging to God, not to humans. This reinforces the responsibility given to humans to be careful stewards of the land God has given them. Michael continues to help Adam and Eve (and Milton’s readers) make sense of their relationship with the Earth by reminding Adam shortly afterwards that “all the earth, / Not this rock only” belongs to God and is “fomented by his virtual power and warmed. / All the earth he gave thee to possess and rule, / No despicable gift” (11.335–40). All the Earth belongs to God, and God has given humans a responsibility to take care of all His creation. By echoing the language of Genesis here, Milton makes it clear that the environmental responsibility God designated to humans before the Fall continues to be the expectation after the Fall.

## Conclusion

Education is of incredible importance to Milton, and *Paradise Lost* can and should be read as more than just a story about the Fall of humanity; it should be seen as deeply instructional. In the beginning of the poem, Milton promises to “justify the ways of God to men” (1.26). When reading the poem through an ecological lens, readers can understand what Milton believes God’s intentions are for humanity’s relationship with the physical space that they occupy as well as all types of life they interact with. Through his characters—Satan, the fallen angels, Adam and Eve, and God—Milton is presenting different models for how to treat non-human life on the planet and asks his readers to either accept or reject these diverging paths. While Milton would certainly balk at his work being compared to that of a Catholic pope, a similarly Christian environmental ethic is developed in Pope Francis’s *Laudato Si’*. Satan and his fellow fallen angels are rampant extractivists who are, in Francis’s words, “consumers, ruthless exploiters, unable to set limits on their immediate needs.” Similarly, it is Adam and Eve, both before *and* after the Fall, who are shown as “intimately united with all that exists” and thus engaging in reciprocal, caring relationships with all life within their ecosystem (Francis). While extractivism’s hold on Western society may appear inescapable, Milton’s centuries-old epic offers an alternative. Instead of treating dominion over the environment as an excuse to destroy it for personal gain, the human heroes in *Paradise Lost* are shown caring for the world around them and exercising restraint in what they take. Climate solutions often look to the future and try to imagine new technologies, policies, or industries that can fix human-caused global warming. Perhaps a shift away from extractivism, instead, requires imagining something that has been lost, and working once again to care for the planet as if it is paradise.

### Works Cited

- Chagnon, Christopher W., et al. "From Extractivism to Global Extractivism: The Evolution of an Organizing Concept." *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, vol. 49, no. 4, pp. 760–92.
- Hiltner, Ken. "Place Defined: The Ecological Importance of Place." *Milton and Ecology*, Cambridge UP, 2003, pp. 11–29.
- Francis. "Laudato Si': On Care for our Common Home." *The Holy See*, 24 May 2015, [https://www.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/encyclicals/documents/papa-francesco\\_20150524\\_encyclica-laudato-si.html](https://www.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/encyclicals/documents/papa-francesco_20150524_encyclica-laudato-si.html).
- McColley, Diane. "The Commodious Ark: Nature's Voice in Early Modern Poetry." *The Environmental Tradition in English Literature*, edited by John Parham, Taylor and Francis, 2016, pp. 130–43.
- Milton, John. *Paradise Lost*, edited by David Scott Kastan, Hackett, 2005.
- Remien, Peter. "Satan's Pause: Wonder and Environmental Preservation in *Paradise Lost*." *Interdisciplinary Studies in Literature and Environment*, vol. 20, no. 4, 2013, pp. 817–36.
- Smith, Sarah. "The Ecology of Chaos." *Milton Studies*, vol. 59, no. 1, 2017, pp. 31–55.
- The Bible*. King James Version, <https://www.biblegateway.com/versions/King-James-Version-KJV-Bible/#booklist>.
- Theis, Jeffery. "The Environmental Ethics of *Paradise Lost*: Milton's Exegesis of Genesis I–III." *Milton Studies*, vol. 34, no. 1, 1996, pp. 61–81.