

ENVIRONMENTAL PHILOSOPHY

Men have different behaviors towards nature. Analyzing economists, philosophers and climate scientists' works, we can identify three macro areas: dominion, coordination and cooperation. These macro areas are different visions of man and of his role in the world, in which are included different environmental philosophies. Men's behaviors towards nature are influenced by these environmental philosophies, because they justify and legitimate men's actions.

In dominion behavior men think to be more important than nature and, for this reason, to have right to dominate and use it for their purposes. One of its first formulations is in the Genesis: when God create at last man and woman, He says them that all the rest of the world was made for them and that they will rule over other creatures. Jewish and Christian cultures started from this vision of dominion. In Greek history of philosophy we can see a change between pre-sophistic and post-sophistic thinker, because sophists have brought the point of view from *arché* to the human being, which became measure of all thing. This anthropocentrism, later mixed with Christian behavior of domain over the word, brings to a more complex theory in which the man is the center of the world and everything he does to gained his purposes it is his own natural (or divine) right. This world vision grows up during the centuries and now we can find it in neoliberal capitalism and in neo-positivist science. In neoliberal capitalism it means that man can do everything he wants to nature to gain his profit. He can destroy and re-build, he can overuse and consume: nature is considered just an economic index as others, and so it have to be monetize. In neo-positivistic science the epistemological assumption of division between subject studying and object studied have leded many scientific discovers but also two main problems. The first one is epistemological: nature is not just an object, it can react at stimulation and it is influenced by researchers presence. This means an alteration in research methodologies and this implies ethical questions (that are the second problem): can scientists do everything they want towards their studied objects? If not, which are the limits of their experiments? In the world view of domain, the answer is that limit is man safety: so, if we don't hurt man safety (or better, civilized man safety), we can use nature to test our theory as we want (e. g. nuclear text).

Coordination behavior developed during the last years and it includes the assumption of man centrality in the world, but mixing it with an ethical sense of responsibility. So, it is not a simple domain but a more complex coordination between men with the aim of using and exploiting nature, thinking also to nature needs. This sense of responsibility is expressed for the first time in *Our common future*, the first official text about sustainable Development. Sense of responsibility is

addicted to dominion assumptions to limit men actions towards nature and other men, in order to ensure a future for all humans. In fact, many studies had already demonstrated the incidence of men action in climate change and ecological diseases; so it have been thought to empower men of their action. The matter is now who establish the ecological limits for men action and how control their behaviors. The political power seems to be the subject of these actions, because it can use instrument of control on economic production and forbidden or stimulate activities. In fact in front of global problems, political power created laws starting from global apparatus: i. g. the U.N.'s directives about environment, influencing or constraining to change country laws, that, by their side, influenced local laws. The lawmaking process starts from up (global institution) to down (local problems), but this up-down road has two big problems: the first one is that global institutions are not felt licit from public opinion that can see their laws like a limitation of their freedom; the second one is that these institutions can be easily influenced by economic power to protect their interests. In this political process, just production is limited by law, the other side of economic life, consumption, is not interested at all. But, if men don't change their ways of consumptions, the production will always need to expend and to pollute to cover the economy demand.

The second problem is about how international organizations, influenced by these principles, have worked *de facto*. If we consider U. N.'s directives again, we can see the lack of foresight in taking on the problems only after these problems emerge. There isn't any precautionary directive, but only decisions about what it has already happened: i. g. there isn't any hint about the problem of destruction of biodiversity, that is a problem that could create in the future lots of bad consequences.

Cooperation behavior, instead, recognize right to nature because it think to it as a subject, not an object. Cooperation recognizes an ontological parity united to an important factual difference: men can act with intentionality on nature to conform it to their scope. This means that men are the main actor of the cooperation, but also that the nature has its own rights. Men acting on nature must calculate their action in order to hurt nature as less as possible, also if it may be a disadvantage for man. The most important part of cooperation philosophy is that man has to respect nature time without accelerate it (we can notice that this behavior is the first one that man have had towards nature after the fear: men discovered that they could work with nature to improve their well-being; e. g. pagan rites were not made to control nature, but to ingratiate it and research its collaboration). Collaboration is a direct behavior man-nature, which may not take on global environmental problems, because global problems need a strong coordination by the high to be solved. We can say that without coordination, domination behavior can survive and expand, whilst for cooperation behavior is impossible solve global problem without an international coordination. The ethical problem of cooperation behavior is: how much we must change our habit to meet the nature right?

From which a political question starts: can policy reduce our consumers' freedom to help us to meet nature preservation? Degrowth theory tries to answer to these questions, introducing the assumption that western world must auto-limit itself, for ecological, social and psychological reasons.

We can identify these three philosophies with three social-economic models: dominion/growth, coordination/sustainable development and cooperation/degrowth. Here, these three world view are analyzed just starting from the question about which is the ontological status of nature, and we saw different answers for different world views. The conflict is now between dominion and cooperation and the battlefields are the man's habits.