

**ECOLOGIZATION OF ETHICS AND ETHIZATION OF ECOLOGY IN  
THE PHILOSOPHICAL DIALOGUE OF RECENT HISTORY (LATE XX  
- EARLY XXI CENTURY)**

**Professor, doctor (Philosophy) T.S. Troizka**

**Professor, doctor (Philosophy) O.M. Troizka**

**Associate professor, PhD (History) A.M. Krylova**

**Associate professor, PhD (Philosophy) O.V. Popravko**

**Associate professor, PhD (Pedagogy) T.M. Dyuzhikova**

Bogdan Khmelnytsky Melitopol State Pedagogical University, Melitopol, Ukraine

**ABSTRACT**

Modern actualization of the global problems of mankind indicates that environmental problems occupy one of the first places in terms of threat level. An analysis of studies of this period indicates that far from many publications, these problems are formulated as the tasks of harmonization and humanization of relations between society and nature. Most non-philosophical works tend to analyze planetary resource problems and disaster prevention. This interpretation is a continuation of the deterministic approach to relations with nature, anthropocentrism, which even in a reflexed form (humanism) does not change the “anthropological” attempts of a person “as an imperfect natural being” to socially compete with it. The article shows that in research and practice, the problem of including nature as a specific subject in the sphere of ethics is not focused on, nature is not explicated as a complex organized system in which society is part of it. Based on the analysis of the dynamics of the development of the ecological crisis, it is proved that the main sign of the current anthropological situation and the reason for the deepening crisis is the steady desire of Homo Sapiens to change the surrounding reality in various ways. The latter significantly exaggerate the possibilities of nature and on a much smaller scale change the consciousness, worldview of a person in favor of humanity and harmonization of relations with nature. Recently, in humanism, works have appeared on the “rehabilitation of practical reason”, which is the cause of moral imbalance in the relations of ethics and politics, ethics and science, ethics and medicine. At the same time, the matter does not reach the philosophical interpretation of the crisis as a universal ontological and value-semantic reflection. Therefore, the aim of the article is to define critically and synthesize the provisions presented in the philosophical dialogue on the environmental crisis, and those that, in our opinion, should be implemented as ethical principles in environmental issues, and environmental knowledge in ethics.

To this end were analyzed – ethics of responsibility K.-O. Apel, the principles of G. Jonas eco-ethics, the ideas of “reverence for life” by A. Schweitzer, the problems of environmental communication N. Luman and other works. On this conceptual basis and on the results of a questionnaire of applicants for philosophical education to understand

nature as an object of ethical responsibility and overcome anthropocentrism in ethics, an anthropometric methodology is proposed. According to this methodology, the imperative of saving life is combined with the preservation of being, the proportionality of a person's being with the whole world and his responsibility for being, which is to be measured. The main conclusion is the conceptualization, explication and disclosure of the meaning of anthropometry as a construct of "ecologization" of ethics and ethization of ecology.

**Keywords:** ecologization, ethics, ethization, ecology, environmental, society, philosophical education, nature

## INTRODUCTION

The anthropological situation, as never before, focuses on the negative consequences of the target orientations of technogenic civilization and the need to rethink human life in the whole complex of threats, problems and challenges of the time. The analysis and actualization of the global problems of mankind shows that one of the first places on the level of threat is posed by environmental problems. Man's attempt to "have" as much as possible "to be human" in the mastery of material values and natural resources, was formed into a utilitarian-pragmatic guideline for the transformation of nature into "own way", the object of meeting the needs of Homo sapiens. In this technocratic system of goals and meanings, the interaction of nature and society was not evaluated in terms of "moral and immoral", and the incompatibility of such meanings of attitudes toward nature began to acquire the features of an apocalyptic future. The use of scientific, informational, and production technologies in this process further intensifies the scale of ways of resolving global contradictions that are detrimental to humanity, which are "shifted" to the plane of "instrumental, technological reason." Thus, public awareness of this problem "corresponds" to science as an imperative requirement, finding ways out of the crisis and preventing the threatening course of events.

## METHODS OF RESEARCH

Based on critical analysis and synthesis of research on this topic, it is established that most of the humanities fills this block with global resource problems, problems of disaster prevention, issues of rational use of raw materials, food, energy and other components of environmental issues. This whole cycle allows us to conclude that such an interpretation is a continuation of the deterministic approach to relations with nature and anthropocentrism, which even in a reflected form (humanism) does not change the "anthropological" efforts of man "as an imperfect natural being" to compete with it socially. As before, in the time of the global environmental crisis, research and practice do not focus on the problem of including nature as a subject in the field of ethics and its consideration as a complex organized system in which society should be considered a part. Recently, works have appeared in the humanities on the "rehabilitation of practical reason", which should correct the ethical imbalance in the relationship between ethics and politics, ethics and science, ethics and medicine, and so on. All of them, referring to the apocalyptic tendencies associated with the ecological crisis, try in different discourses to bring the understanding of the ecological situation to anthropological with a certain moral dimension, but only philosophers interpreted this crisis as universal-ontological, threatening to exist as such (K.- O. Apel, V. Kulman, D. Bohler, G. Jonas, A.

Yermolenko, T. Troitska and others), and in some publications these problems are formulated as tasks of harmonization and humanization of relations of society and nature [9]. In all other works, nature is the object of domination by the "instrumental mind", according to which science, technology, economics are modernized independently of the "value postulates" (M. Weber). To this position should be added the fact that the dynamics of development did not always relate to the laws of natural development, as it was during the reign of cosmocentrism (philosophy of antiquity).

Thus, it becomes necessary to reconstruct the philosophical positions on the normative-ideological positions of the reorientation of man's attitude to nature. Therefore, the purpose of the article is to conceptualize the dialogical universals of harmonization of the interaction of society and nature on the basis of synthesis and critical analysis of philosophical thought of the late 19 - early 20 century.

The dialogical positions of philosophical thought of the end of the 19 century and the beginning of the 20 century were subjected to methodological and epistemological search. The article uses such generally accepted scientific approaches and methods of theoretical solution of the problem as axiological, anthropological, synergetic, concrete-historical, phenomenological approaches. It was they who made it possible to comprehend the discussion positions.

## DISCUSSION

The first. The current actualization of global problems of mankind, despite the existence of different classifications, confirms their importance and the fact that the leading place in global problems is occupied by environmental problems. However, the focus of scholars and practitioners on this issue, in our opinion, has a specific focus, namely: the main issues are globalization, its varieties, the growing interconnectedness and interdependence of national economies, political and social systems; globalism, on the one hand, as an objective reality of a single space and, on the other hand, as a subjective interpenetration and regulation of this process by society at the level of ideology, politics, value priorities.

However, the concept of "globality" as a certain feature of human life in terms of the integrity of its biosocio-spiritual nature remains outside the value-semantic understanding of these problems. In this interpretation of global issues, the semantic emphasis is shifted to measuring the impact of globalization and globalism on human living standards.

The second. Among many other tasks, philosophical analytics has a special task - to compare the ways of thinking and acting of people, including philosophical concepts, ideals and real mechanisms for solving problems. That is why it is fundamentally important to establish certain differences in the understanding of value-semantic correlations for assessing the significance of this change in human attitudes to nature. Thus, according to the results of an express survey of applicants for higher education of the Master's level (Bogdan Khmelnytsky Melitopol State Pedagogical University, Ukraine) it is established that students of natural sciences refer to the elimination of global problems that do not involve anthropological (value-semantic) aspect nuclear war, environmental problems, the problem of harmonization of international relations, etc.), and undergraduates in the humanities identified the degree of their threat in the classification: intersocial, anthroposocial and natural-social. In each of these groups, the

harmonization of the cultural dimension of the culture of attitude to other subjects (objects) is mandatory.

This imperative requirement is due to the anthropological situation, namely that modern Homo sapiens changes the surrounding reality in several ways that greatly exaggerate the possibilities of the world, including nature. In addition, these changes are taking place on a much larger scale in relation to changes in the world around us.

The third. It should be noted that recently in various discursive practices there are quite radical proposals to change the worldview of man to the world of people and the world of nature. A clear example of this trend can be considered the issues and focus of the World Environmental Forum, a meeting of leaders of states, representatives of international organizations and business (January 21-24, 2020, Davos). Despite criticism from environmental activists, D. Trump said: "We must reject the eternal prophets who foretell doom and their prophecies about the apocalypse. Now is not the time for pessimism, but for optimism. We will not allow radical socialists to destroy our economy [5]. In particular, the development of new technologies and possible threats from their introduction; health issues, environmental issues, the initiative to plant 1 billion trees on the planet and others, which WEF founder Klaus Schwab called the main ones: "Restoration of the ecosystem is a priority for the coming decade, we want to leave a lasting legacy for future generations".

Certain prognostic positions, of course, are not able to replace the purposeful worldview-critical regulations on human attitudes to nature, which offers a philosophical reflection on the humanization of society and nature, developed in dialogue in the late 19 - early 20 century. First, based on the analysis of the dynamics of the ecological crisis, it is proved that the main feature of the current anthropological situation and the cause of the deepening crisis is the constant desire of Homo sapiens to change the surrounding reality in ways that greatly exaggerate the possibilities of nature. "Human" attitude to it and do not contribute to the harmonization of relations with nature. But this conceptual position is not mentioned in many works of humanities [7; 8; 9]. The main questions posed by researchers in this area are: Can nature become the subject of ethical responsibility of man in terms of scientific and technological civilization? The problem of overcoming anthropologism in ethics. Discursive and ethical interpretation of the ecological imperative. How do scientific-technical and discursive-ethical rationality relate in solving environmental problems? (A. Yermolenko), Anthropologism or anthropocentrism in the ethics of nature? Can nature become the subject of ethical responsibility in the methodology of human (dimensionality) (T. Troitska) and others.

In the dialogical positions of "rehabilitation of practical reason" and overcoming the ethical imbalance in the relationship between man and nature, we have actualized the universal-ontological and value-semantic reflection of the problem, which will give impetus to the search for philosophical "constructs" of critical rethinking and synthesizing principles in environmental issues, and environmental knowledge – in ethics.

These "acquisitions" include:

- ethics of responsibility K.-O. Apel and D. Boehler, which complements the categorical imperative of Kant with the requirements of extending the principles of ethics of responsibility not only to existential manifestations and human intentions, but also to strengthen the requirements for legitimizing programs, projects, research that may have a negative impact on the environment [1];

- principles of ecoethics of the German-American philosopher G. Jonas, who proposed to consider nature as an ethical problem, ie man's attitude to nature should be exactly the same as the attitude to people, thus a combination of ethics and ecology and a new direction of applied philosophy – ecoethics, and human responsibility for the ecological condition is a fundamental requirement [2];

– A. Schweizer's ideas of "reverence for life", which gave a new impetus to the ethics of "preservation of the living", according to which man must be in harmony with all living things, ie in a certain "common with nature system – in the ethosphere"; he justifies this view by the urgent practical need to translate the ethics of reverence for life, including nature, as created by God, and accordingly it implies personal norms of care and submission, "because the destruction of culture occurs due to the fact that the creation of ethics , not a person" [4];

– problems of ecological communication N. Luhmann defined, in our opinion, the need to perceive the ethics of nature as an awareness of the existence of a holistic system "Nature-Man" as opposed to caring for the environment and overcoming the ecological crisis, in this concept it is proposed to direct communication [3].

On this conceptual basis and on the results of questionnaires of philosophical education seekers to realize the ethical responsibility for saving human life, which depends on many factors, we propose to consider overcoming anthropocentrism in human ethics and ethics of nature as the leading worldview "construct". To this end, each of the philosophical positions we have reflected (K.-O. Apel, G. Jonas, A. Yermolenko, N. Luhmann, A. Schweizer and others) is complementary to the methodology of human (dimensionality), the content of which we have revealed in scientific publications [6].

According to this methodology, the imperative of preserving life is combined with the preservation of being and the world, appears as the proportionality of human existence with the whole world and responsibility for being as the cause and guarantor of being to be measured. Humanity is a conceptual basis for reflection on man's attitude to nature, which is to recognize the following postulates:

- Preservation of nature and being is possible if a person corresponds to the "cultural code" of man, ie contains a "human" attitude to everything in the world. If man, unquestionably perceiving his own essence as a biosocio-spiritual being (*Homo sapiens* – intelligent man), seeks to become "*Homo sapientis* – a wise man" and recognizes the genetic priority of nature in relation to its essence and place in the supersystem "Nature", relies on its laws and environmental imperative.

## RESULTS

The set of research procedures represented by reflection (understanding the essence of the relationship between society and nature), analysis, synthesis, homogenization, totalization (interaction of nature-subject and humanity-subject in toto) and other analytical-hermeneutic formalizations made it possible to substantiate the leading value-semantic (worldview) vector in changing the interaction of the components of the supersystem "Nature – Man", which is human (dimensionality) (the proportionality of human existence as human and human as coexistence in nature). The main result of this work at the philosophical level is also represented by the development of normative ideas

of human attitude to nature, which should change on the basis of value-semantic orientation to the ethics of ecology and the greening of ethics.

The conceptualization of dialogical universals on the harmonization of the interaction of society and nature is based on the synthesis and critical analysis of philosophical thought of the late 19 - early 20 century. On the basis of this analysis it is established that not in many publications these problems are formulated as tasks of harmonization and humanization of relations of a society and the nature; it is proved that the majority of non-philosophical works tend to analyze global resource problems and natural disaster prevention problems; this interpretation is explained as a continuation of the deterministic approach to relations with nature and anthropocentrism, which even in a reflected form (humanism) does not change the "anthropological" efforts of man "as an imperfect natural being" to compete with it socially; it is shown that research and practice do not focus on the problem of including nature as a subject in the field of ethics, that nature is not explained as a complex organized system in which society is part of it. Based on the analysis of the dynamics of the ecological crisis, it is proved that the main feature of the current anthropological situation and the reason for the deepening crisis is the constant desire of Homo sapiens to change the environment in ways that, firstly, greatly exaggerate the possibilities of nature and, secondly, change the consciousness, worldview of man in favor of humanity and the harmonization of relations with nature.

## CONCLUSION

The main conclusion is to confirm the relevance of this issue and the need to intensify its solution at all levels of human life. In the functional field of philosophy there is an opportunity to influence the value-worldview of man in relation to his existence in the world of nature. "Rehabilitation of practical reason", which is the cause of ethical imbalance in the relationship between nature and man, some developments to strengthen ethics in the field of "nature-society" did not affect the large-scale philosophical interpretation of the global crisis as a universal-ontological and value-semantic "inadequacy" of society and critical human reflection. Therefore, rethinking and synthesizing the provisions presented in the philosophical dialogue on the ecological crisis (ethics of responsibility K.-O. Apel, the principles of ecoethics G. Jonas, the idea of "reverence for life" A. Schweizer, the problems of ecological communication N. Luhmann) must be implemented, as ethical principles in environmental issues, and environmental knowledge - in ethics. The authors of the article propose to make adjustments to the understanding of the ecological global problem through worldview-value reflection of globality and methodology of human (dimensionality), according to which the imperative of life preservation is combined with preservation of being, proportionality of human existence with the whole world. In this way, the conceptualization, explication and disclosure of the meaning of human (dimensionality) becomes a construct of "greening of ethics and ethization of ecology.

**REFERENCES**

- [1] Apel K.-O. Die ökologische Krise als Herausforderung für Diskursethik. Im Diskurs mit Hans Jonas. München: Beck, 1994. p. 369 – 404.
- [2] Jonas G. The principle of responsibility. In search of ethics for technological civilization. Das Prinzip Verantwortung. Versuch einer Ethik für die technologische Zivilisation. K.: Libra, 2001. 400 p.
- [3] Luhmann N., *Ökologische Kommunikation*. Opladen, 1986
- [4] Schweizer A. *A reverence for life*. M.: Progress, 1992. 400 p.
- [5] Schwab K. World Economic Forum – a meeting of state leaders, representatives of international organizations and business. Davos, 2020. URL: <https://www.rbc.ua/rus/news/forum-davose-2020-glavnoe-1579530332.html>
- [6] Troitska T.S. Anthropological intentions of the value attitude of man to nature in the Ukrainian philosophical tradition: the methodological aspect "Philosophical methodology as a factor of modernization of teacher's professional training". Simferopol: Tavriya, 2006. 268 p.
- [7] Troitska T.S., Taranenko G.G., Troitska E.M., Popravko O.V. Historical reconstruction of the reproduction of axiology of nature in Ukrainian philosophical tradition: methodological reference points. 6th SWS International Scientific Conference on Social Sciences. 2019. Conference Proceedings. Sofia, Bulgaria, 2019. vol.6, N1. p. 107-115. [doi.org/10.5593/SWS.ISCAN.2019.1](https://doi.org/10.5593/SWS.ISCAN.2019.1)
- [8] Troitska T.S., Troitska E.M., Krylova A.M., Popravko O.V. Reconstruction and dialogue in the recovery of the lost paradigm «human-nature» International multidisciplinary scientific geoconference SGEM 2019. STEF92 Technology Ltd., 51 "Alexander Malinov" Blvd., 1712 Sofia. Bulgaria. P.629-635 DOI: 10.5593/sgem2019/5.1/S20.078 <https://www.sgem.org/index.php/elibrary-research-areas?view=publication&task=show&id=6028>
- [9] Yermolenko A.M. *Communicative practical philosophy*. Kiev: Libra, 1999. 488 p.

