Approach to the formation of environmental ethics

Abduazimova Zarina Amirovna
Academic staff of the department *in* the National University of Uzbekistan named after Mirzo Ulugbek

Abstract—This article examines the scientific approach to the formation of environmental ethics in society. How can natural resources and human values in general be ensured and preserved? Today all thinking people of the planet feel and understand that we are walking the road of anthropogenic civilization towards the eco-technological apocalypse. The main signs of the impending catastrophe are the destruction of the biosphere, the chemical poisoning of man and nature, the degradation of the "natural" man. In the Declaration of the Earth, adopted by the UNESCO International Commission in 2000, the current world situation is characterized as follows: "Dominant production and consumption patterns lead to ecological devastation, depletion of resources and the mass extinction of biological species.

Index Terms— Morality, culture, societies, ecology, approach.

INTRODUCTION

1. THE INEVITABILITY OF THE ECOLOGICAL AND ETHICAL REVOLUTION

1.1 Formation of ethical views

Deepening of the moral component in the relationship between man and nature, the formation of a moral way of thinking to overcome the utilitarian and technocratic attitude of man to nature - these are the most acute problems facing today and ethics, and ecology. The problem of the relationship of ethics and ecology in the philosophical tradition of the West occupies an important place. Ethical and philosophical foundations of the ecological situation in the context of the philosophy of technology and economy are thoroughly crafted in the works of G. Jonas, M. Heidegger, V. Hösle and others, resulting in the emergence of the philosophy of ecological crisis - the most influential trend of modern thought. Modern domestic research is devoted to the study and understanding of various aspects, the problems of the relationship of ethics and ecology. A fairly wide range of topics are touched upon here: general philosophical questions about the perception of nature; specificity of religious attitude towards, nature, adopted in Orthodoxy; a critical analysis of the radical decolonization of consciousness beyond ethical foundations; the influence of the religious and moral factor on the development of ecological culture.

The development of the moral paradigm of the relationship between man and nature, which presupposes the transformation of moral consciousness, seems to be the most urgent in solving modern environmental problems. For this, it is necessary to understand the essential difference between the concept of "ethics", formulated on the basis of classical Western European rationalist philosophy and the concept of "morality", more acceptable for the traditions of Russian philosophy. In this sense, there is a paradoxical dissimilarity of "ecological ethics", based on the canons of Western philosophy and the "moral attitude to nature", which also takes place in Russian philosophy.

In ethics, as a rule, two main problems stand out: one is the question of what is good in itself, the second is the question of what has value as a means for achieving good. In other words, it is a question of the difference between intrinsic value and instrumental value; while the definition of what and to what extent has an intrinsic value appears as a special task of ethics. "As soon as we think about the concepts of" intrinsic value "or" inner good, "wrote D. Moore, or we say that something" must exist, "the object of our thinking is a unique object-the only thing of its kind , which I designate as "good". The ethical evaluation of an object as a good does not coincide with any other evaluation of this thing - neither with an evaluation of utility, nor with an appreciation of pleasure, nor with the discovery of some of its natural properties. With regard to the subject of environmental ethics, it can be identified as the benefit of all living beings and ecosystems. Claiming: "This is good," we mean that the subject in question is in some definite value relation to some other thing.

Environmental ethics assess human actions in terms of eco-systemic benefits. Eco system assessment seems to us a more complex cognitive process than the establishment of ethical judgments in the human sphere. In ecological ethics, it is important to consider not only the immediate result of human action, but also the "results of these results," as D. Mura put it. Meanwhile, it is obvious that our foresight can never be so accurate that we can say with certainty that the action in question gives the best possible outcome in the long term.

Environmental ethics does not tell us what to do, does not indicate that such a decision is the only true one. Our knowledge of causes and effects in the world is too incomplete to comply with such instructions. "We can never be sure that such an act will realize the highest possible value." However, there remains a more modest task that environmental ethics is likely to be able to solve, namely, to find out which of the most probable alternatives will create the greatest amount of benefits in the universe. But even such a task is immeasurably difficult. Saying that nature protection is better than

nature is a consumer ideology, we want to say that the first alternative has a greater intrinsic value than the second. Choosing this or that act, we believe that it is the best, that is, the degree of the intrinsic value of an act, together with the value of its consequences, is greater than that of any alternative.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1. Unity of natural and human values

Value is the basic term of ethics. From the value of this or that phenomenon, we deduce obligations in relation to it. Ethics of the environment becomes possible only when the intrinsic value of natural phenomena is realized and corresponding obligations are formulated in relation to them. All ethical teachings, as a rule, relate value to a person; Environmental ethics expands the concept of value to the scales of the eco-systemic good. This approach allows preserving traditional humanistic values and at the same time affirming ecological holism. We must respect the nature with reverence, then we also have the right to allow ourselves "humane way of life" in relation to the laws of its beauty. Environmental ethics asserts the very value of nature and simultaneously introduces the world of nature into the space of human values. Here, the relation of man to nature is weighed "on the ideal scales of morality," as A.A Guseynov put it. Morality is a form of self-mediation, self-restraint, self-denial. From the point of view of ecological ethics, the condition for moral behavior of a person is the rejection of violence towards nature, thereby not harming all living things, renouncing luxury and consumerism.

As a rule, two positions are distinguished in ecological ethics: anthropocentrism and biocentrism. Anthropocentrism is the idea that human behavior in relation to nature must be evaluated on the basis of how it affects human well-being, whereas biocentrism defends the view that human behavior with respect to nature should be evaluated on the basis of how it affects on other living beings or ecosystems.

Anthropocentrists prove that only people have an intrinsic value or moral status. The argument put forward by biocentrists is this: all living beings or ecosystems have an intrinsic value or moral status. Our position is such that the convergence of anthropocentrism and biocentrism is necessary in order to ensure the protection of nature and human health. Differences in value positions should not interfere with the adoption of relevant decisions in the field of environmental protection. For example, anthropocentrists who protect the right of all people (both current and future generations) to a healthy environment, and bio centrists who uphold the interests of "nature" support the course for sustainable development. Sustainable development policy is relevant and effective if and only if it is based on both anthropocentric and bio centric ethics.

The modern practice of sustainable development is based on anthropocentric ethics. The following five principles reveal the content of anthropocentric ethics of sustainable development: a) the principle of compensation by the corporation (enterprise) of social and environmental costs; b) the principle of environmental responsibility; c) the principle of limiting the consumption of material goods; d) the principle of the priority of human health.
Anthropocentric ethics of sustainable development is the concept of preserving one's own "home of being". The blessing of humanity (the present and future generations of people) is above all. Concern for the protection of the environment is acceptable to the extent that it contributes to the maintenance of the ecological well-being of man and mankind.

The biocentrism ethic of sustainable development is based on the value of nature. In particular, it recognizes a) the value of diversity; b) the value of natural evolution; c) the value of a rarity (species, individual, object); d) the value of beauty; e) the value of life in the community; e) the value of Mother Earth, etc.

Nature is the bearer and holder of objective values. The earth existed before the appearance of man; and it would be absurd, for example, to say that the appearance of man has made valuable a creature in an evolving ecosystem: value relations are formed at the level of the biological organization of matter long before the appearance of man. Therefore, people in their evaluation of nature must follow nature itself. In nature itself there are "pre-values," which seem to be inflamed by human interest. Holmes Ralston cites the following list of values of nature: life-sustaining, economic, aesthetic, historical, scientific, religious, cultural, symbolic, therapeutic, etc. In the hierarchy of values of environmental ethics (as a synthesis of biocentrism and anthropocentrism), the highest position is occupied by the category of life, embracing both human life and the life of nature.

3. RESULTS

3.1. Values of environmental ethics

Science and religion are the two pillars on which the value axis of ecological ethics is based. Both values are necessary for the formation of the ethics of the environment, providing contact with two significant but different spheres of human existence. Science is important for environmental ethics at least - in three aspects. First, science can formulate constraints that impose social and biological structures on human behavior; secondly, science can more or less reliably assess the consequences of decision-making for man and nature; Thirdly, science helps to form an integral worldview, within which we make environmental decisions. Although science is an important source of ethics, it alone is not enough to build ecological ethics. Frederick Gregory rightly notes that "in the face of an environmental crisis, the radical separation of science from religion is an intellectual luxury that humanity can not afford." In this context, we are not trying to appreciate the diversity of religious thought about nature, but at least we can note the relevance and significance of all world religions for the development of environmental ethics. For example, in the Taoist-Buddhist tradition, the path to harmony and integrity is the purity of thoughts, freedom from the power of passions and desires, the failure of ugly actions, the ability to follow the natural order of things. Buddhist

ethics encourage humility and moderation, simplicity and frugality, meditation and compassion. Buddhist philosophy justifies the inextricable link between morality and human ecology; it is such interdependence that, in fact, it is about some kind of integrity, about some identity.

Ethics concern on human relation to nature, where people are considered as moral agents due to their conscience. Water and land are provided by nature to be explored and managed in a wise and sustainable way. Any human induced activities, such as agriculture, settlement, mining, and water pumping could have an impact on the environment and have therefore contributed to Climate change within decades despite of the nature cycles. This study describes human nature relationship, socio spatial processes embedded as environment ethics in a community level of farmers in Gunungkidul Karstic region, South Java, Indonesia.

People struggle, survive, and cope with harsh conditions particularly during dry season due to annual water scarcity that lead them to explore and apply knowledge, skills and available resources to sustain their livelihood, and live in harmony with Karst environment. Karstlandscape in Gunungkidulreflects the human relation with their nature or environment in Karst regions and empirically describes their environmental ethics. In this study, the way people value their environment was explored through field observation and participatory approachontheir understanding of local knowledge called PranotoMongso a traditional seasonal calendar. They have faced changing economic, social, and climatic factors in the past decade. This affected the application of the traditional seasonal calendar and has changed some people's behavior and perception on the environment. Media sharing knowledge is important to reach individual and collective participatory environment ethical behavior.Immoral behavior not only destroys human health, but it causes a global conflagration, world chaos. Buddhist thinker Padmasambhava (8th century AD) wrote: "Towards the end of the era, when the egoism of humanity will continuously increase, when criminals become leaders and these leaders steal and steal, and tall teachers will roam the streets like beggars, then there will be world chaos. The destroyed heavenly order will release epidemics, famine and war, unexpected floods, fires and hurricanes. "Such are the consequences of the destruction of morality. We can learn a lot from Taoism and Buddhism, especially in that part of them that is related to respect for the world and the cosmos.

The biblical tradition also includes taking care of nature. The earth belongs to God - and people are commanded to be responsible keepers of it, "to cultivate the garden and take care of it" (3: 23). From the standpoint of the ethics of sustainable development, the Biblical justification for the need to limit consumption and ascetic morality is of interest. Ian Barbour offers a synthesis of ecology and Christianity, and this synthesis seems to him "a promising conceptual basis for environmental ethics." Let us note in connection with the above that not only Christianity, but the entire religious tradition contains a huge value potential for environmental ethics. Without the revival of both the transcendental and ascetic ideals of religion, we cannot restrain human greed, which is the main source of environmental disasters. Perhaps limiting our desires and needs is the main condition for the survival of mankind.

No matter how much we call for saving nature, this will change little in the current ecological situation, since possession in the value hierarchy means more than being itself, and the transformation of the world is more than the content of being. It is necessary to actively counter the public to the forces of technocracy, it is necessary to create a counterbalance to scientific and technical activism, to lay down the value prerequisites for such a way of being a person in the world that guarantees the co-evolution of man and nature. To this end, one should turn to religion as a spiritual source of environmental ethics. Religion affirms an unselfish attitude toward being, cultivates reverence for life. So, ecological ethics is equally based on both religion and science. Anyone who finds a scientific truth about the nature of nature and will be able to connect it with the spiritual imperative of religion will come to a genuine ecological ethic that will help us to observe the proper measure in mastering nature and avoid ecological catastrophe.

4. CONCLUSIONS

4.1. Natural and human values

Our era - after VI. Vernadsky - often called the era of the no sphere (the sphere of reason). "Created during the entire geological time," V.I.Vernadsky wrote, "the biosphere, established in its equilibrium, is beginning to change more and more under the pressure of the scientific thought of mankind ... Obviously, this aspect of the course of man's scientific thought is a natural phenomenon." Defining the noosphere as the highest stage of the development of the Earth's biosphere, in the conditions of which scientific thought becomes an effective planetary force, Vernadsky put into this concept ecological and ethical content, a high humanistic meaning. In other words, the true concept of the no sphere includes both science and ethics as two equal principles of a new evolutionary change in the biosphere.

Science, devoid of a moral principle, a great sense of reverence for life, can become the foundation for building an ultramodern, technocratic no sphere - a noosphere of a type in excess of an industrial society on a dying planet. Tormans, masterfully described by I. A Efremov in his novel "The Hour of the Bull". Let us be frank: on the planet Earth the technically oriented no sphere has placed the whole world (both the human world and the natural world) on the brink of an ecological and anthropological catastrophe. To save life on planet Earth, it is necessary to revive the ontological status of ethics in the structure of the noosphere. Like the phenomenon of scientific thought, the ethic of reverence for life (ecological ethics) is a natural phenomenon, and in this sense "it carries the possibility of unlimited development in the course of time." For us, it is important that the ideals and priorities of environmental ethics are consistent with the

spontaneous evolutionary process, with the laws of the noosphere and sustainable development of the world. In this capacity, ecological ethics becomes an absolute, planetary force, "the supreme controller of the life of our planet."

REFERENCES

[1] Heidegger M. Talking on a country road / M. Heidegger. M.: Higher School, 1991. - P. 107.

[2] Hösle V. Philosophy and Ecology / V. Hösle Institute of Philosophy.RAN; Otv.red. B.C. Stepin; Trans. from. Nem A.K. Sudakova. M .: Kami, 1994. - 187 p.

[3] D. Mur. Principles of Ethics. M: 1985

[4] Guseynov AA History of Ethical Studies: Analytical Ethics and Metaethics. Pp. 742-753 / A.A. Huseynov // Electronic resource. // http: //www.gumer.info/bibliotekBuks/Culture/Gusein/index.php

[5] Barbour I. Ethics in the Age of Technology / I. Barbour. M .: Biblical Theological Institute, 2001

[6] Vernadsky V.I The chemical structure of the biosphere of the Earth and its environment / V.I. Vernadsky Moscow: Nauka, 1965. - 374 p.

[7] Ermolaeva V.E. Cosmism and ecological ethics // V.E. Ermolaeva Social sciences and the present. 1995. - № 4. - P. 118-124.

[8] Frolov V.V. Moral attitude to the Earth / V.V. Frolov // Ecology and Morality: Materials of Interuniversity. sci. Conf. - Voronezh: VGLTA, 1998.- C. 20-26.

[9] Frolov I.T. Ethics of science: Problems and discussions / I.T. Frolov, B.G. Yudin-M .: Politizdat. 1986. 157 p.

[10] Cannes F.V. Attitude to nature as a social and moral problem. Voronezh: Publishing house of Voronezh University, 1987. - P. 119-138.

[11] Chicherin B.N. The moral world / B.N. Chicherin // Russian philosophy of Right: philosophy of faith and morality (anthology). - St. Petersburg: Aleteya, 1995.-With. 83-110.

[12] . Schweitzer A. Reverence for life / A. Schweitzer. - Moscow: Progress, 1992.-657 p.

[13] Schopenhauer A. On the basis of morality / Schopenhauer A. // Freedom of will and morality. -M .: Republic, 1992. P. 127 - 260.

[14] Ecology and morality: materials of the inter-university. sci. Conf. Ed. prof. V.P. Fetisova, Assoc. N.I. Martynenko. Voronezh: VGLTA, 1998. -80 s

[15] Jaspers K. Origins of history and its purpose / K. Jaspers // The meaning and purpose of history. - M .: Republic, 1994. - 527 p.