



Research Article

Volume-02|Issue-02|2022

"Outside The World": The Limit of Anthropocentrism in the Philosophy of Ecology

Pirnazarov Nurnazar Rashid Uli*¹, & Awezmuratova Ulzada Dastenbaevna²¹Assistant, Karakalpak State University, Nukus, Uzbekistan²Student, Karakalpak State University, Nukus, Uzbekistan

Article History

Received: 28.02.2022

Accepted: 20.03.2022

Published: 27.03.2022

Citation

Uli, P. N. R., & Dastenbaevna, A. U. (2022). "Outside The World": The Limit of Anthropocentrism in the Philosophy of Ecology. *Indiana Journal of Agriculture and Life Sciences*, 2(2), 1-4.

Abstract: The subject of the article is the criticism of anthropocentrism from the point of view of Platonic concepts. The argumentative "limit" of anthropology is environmental issues, one of the most acute problems of our time. The article analyzes the direction of "deep ecology", which is associated with the philosophy of Heidegger, considered by researchers as a criticism of anthropology. At the end of the article, a refutation of Heidegger's "criticality" is proposed, and new ways of criticizing anthropology are outlined.

Keywords: Anthropocentrism, Deep Ecology, Metaphysics, Platonism, Philosophy, Ecology.

Copyright © 2022 The Author(s); This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0).

INTRODUCTION

In connection with ecological catastrophes in the modern world, a new critique of anthropocentrism becomes necessary. Criticism of the anthropological view of the world has already been undertaken by various philosophers in the twentieth century, both in political philosophy, the philosophy of ecology, and in other disciplines. However, the existing concepts cannot be called satisfactory. If we consider environmental arguments in the public sphere, most often these arguments remain anthropocentric. Even the direction of "deep ecology", which is considered radical among ecological currents, does not completely break with anthropocentrism - it is enough to see the philosophical foundations of this direction. Therefore, it is necessary to search for a new theory for successfully arguing the significance of the environment and changing attitudes towards it in the public sphere, and on this basis to develop policy decisions. To do this, it is necessary to consider the philosophical and ecological concepts with which anthropocentrism is associated, as well as to undertake their criticism. We will consider the philosophical concepts of Kant and Heidegger, as well as the concepts of Plato, Frege and Wittgenstein.

As an alternative theory, it is proposed to consider the philosophical direction of Platonism, which makes it possible to build a multi-level ontology. This is important for changing the point of view on the subject of ecology and the environment. Platonism successfully

competed with Aristotelianism throughout the development of the history of philosophy. However, today, when the immanentist attitude prevails in the scientific community, it becomes difficult to put forward a transcendent scheme. Kant fought against it, criticizing metaphysics, ensuring the development of anthropocentrism for two centuries ahead. However, a number of analytic philosophers turn to "ontological dualism" in their philosophy.

The "anthropological turn" is, first of all, philosophical methodology since the middle of the 19th century, after Immanuel Kant proclaimed the question "What is a person" as his final question, which philosophy ultimately seeks to answer. He begins with a critique of metaphysics as speculative knowledge that does not give reason any certainty. Based on this thesis, Kant makes a "Copernican revolution", suggesting that it is not the mind that conforms to objects, but vice versa: "we should try to find out if we can solve the problems of metaphysics more successfully if we proceed from the assumption that objects must conform to our knowledge. , - and this is in better agreement with the requirement of the possibility of a priori knowledge about them, which must establish something about objects before they are given to us. Thus, Kant argues the view that has become one of the foundations of modern science: the world is the way we know it, because we know it with reason. The mind is the filter through which Homo sapiens passes the ideas, impressions and influences of the world. Thanks to the

activity of the mind, a person builds scientific models. Throughout the 19th century, philosophy was being rebuilt "in a new way", engaging in criticism of metaphysics and religion, rebuilding ontology for a person. With this baggage, philosophy enters the 20th century: Bergson and his work "Creative Evolution", the phenomenology of Husserl, Heidegger immediately come to mind. In this scheme, you can not see the limitations. They consist in the fact that since the anthropological attitude considers the world from the point of view of the cognizing subject, then cognition is limited by epistemological limits. Epistemology takes the place of metaphysics for most of the 20th century. The main problem of this attitude is anthropocentrism, which manifests itself in science as a limitation of the possibilities of cognition: since the human mind cognizes, many problems are recognized as pseudo-problems, or problems that have no solution. In the practical sphere, this is expressed, for example, in the fact that environmental problems are considered from the point of view of a person. Man not only "fitted" himself into the natural environment, but led it. In connection with the anthropocentric vision of nature, the micro- and macrocosm, the degree of responsibility for one's own actions has also changed. An example is the numerous disasters associated with the human factor, for example, the accident at the Chernobyl nuclear power plant.

HEIDEGGER AND DEEP ECOLOGY

In his article on deep ecology, Michael Zimmerman writes that the wave of interest in Martin Heidegger among environmentalists is connected with his critique of anthropocentrism. Heidegger criticizes the technical development of modern civilization. Technique brings being out of concealment: for example, a hydroelectric power station is designed to accumulate electricity, while a windmill only used its gifts in proportion to nature. Technology completely changes the natural landscape along with the very purpose of nature - it transforms nature in such a way that it is no longer technology that is a part of being, but that being becomes part of technology: "A hydroelectric power station has been installed on the Rhine. She puts the river to create a hydraulic pressure that causes the turbines to rotate, whose rotation drives the machines that supply electric current, for the transmission of which power systems with their power grid are installed. In the system of interrelated results of the supply of electrical energy, the Rhine stream itself appears as something provided just for this. The hydroelectric power plant is not built into the river in the same way as the old wooden bridge is built, which for centuries has connected one bank to another. Rather, the river is built into a hydroelectric power plant. The Rhine is what it now is as a river, namely, the supplier of hydraulic pressure, thanks to the existence of a hydroelectric power station. As already mentioned,

Heidegger is understood by ecologists as a philosopher who overcomes anthropocentrism. Zimmerman writes that the "turn" in Heidegger's thinking is associated with a reinterpretation of the role of human understanding - being should be understood not in the Kantian way, but on the contrary, human thinking should be thought of as part of being itself. The phenomenological thesis "back to things", postulated by Heidegger, in his opinion, will allow "to see the being as being itself in its being". This thesis has become attractive to ecologists fighting for the preservation of the environment, and the most radical of them - representatives of the "deep ecology". According to them, writes Zimmerman, the responsibility for the environmental catastrophes of our time should be assigned to the anthropocentric attitude that prevails in modern culture.

Criticism of anthropocentrism is expressed in the arguments of Arne Nass, a philosopher and ecologist who was influenced by Heideggerianism. His point of view, close to phenomenology, is that there are no essences or "primary qualities" of things, as well as things themselves: we construct things ourselves in the experience that we acquire. This experience, in fact, is a cycle of interconnected parts of being, because not a single element has a separate existence from others.

Deep ecology has become quite widespread, and besides Heidegger, it is compared with other philosophies, for example, with the position of Plato. In "Platonic Ecology, Deep Ecology" Timothy Mahoney justifies Plato's dualism, which critics reproach him for, by saying that Platonic dualism is a combination of the whole and its parts. Plato's "holism", according to Mahoney, is very close to deep ecology, since regards beings as the sum of their parts. However, critics are zealous and offer another argument - from the world of ideas: since Plato understood ideas as something more important than things, the spatio-temporal world devalued in his philosophy. In response to this criticism, Mahoney says the following: in the *Timaeus* dialogue, Plato presented an understanding of the world organized by a higher rational principle. This world is eternal and is a single organism. As for ideas, "even though the natural world is subordinate to the sphere of ideas, it is good precisely because it reflects the good and harmony of this higher sphere as closely as possible in the spatio-temporal world."

However, I do not agree here with two theses - Zimmermann's thesis about overcoming anthropocentrism by Heidegger and Mahoney's idea about the closeness of the deep ecology of philosophy Plato. First about the first. In lectures on phenomenology, Heidegger explained what being is: "Something like being is given to us in the understanding of being (*Seinsverständnis*), the understanding of being, which underlies any relation to being. Relations to beings are, for their part, inherent in a particular being that we ourselves are, the human

Dasein. He owns the understanding of being, which alone makes possible any kind of relation to beings.

The understanding of being itself has the mode of being of human Dasein. It follows from the reasoning that man is intertwined with being, and being is understood through him. Thus, Heidegger simply changes the angle of consideration. Knowledge of the world is still produced, firstly, from the position of immanence, that is, he considers the world from the inside of the world itself (in connection with this, methodological deformation still occurs). In addition, Heidegger is a rather controversial figure in ideological terms. At the very least, there is some distrust towards his position due to ideological sympathies. As an example, we can point to the speech at his inauguration of the rector of the University of Freiburg on May 27, 1933 7 . In it, he says that the university and the entire German nation should be subordinate to the state. Consequently, this fact is not consistent with his critique of technology. If the German state must exist for the sake of the national state, then how can one conclude from this that Heidegger's priority is precisely ecological thinking? In addition, it is known that Heidegger accepted National Socialism as a "come true" being.

CONCLUSION

The position "outside the world" allows you to expand the possibilities of describing and solving modern problems, for example, it can be used in the philosophy of ecology. Its application is justified, first of all, by the fact that it is an alternative to the anthropocentric view of the world, which is criticized in the philosophy of ecology. Platonism allows you to change the perspective of considering environmental problems from an immanent position to a transcendent one. The article considered both ecological and philosophical theories. The theory of "deep ecology" is associated with the philosophy of Heidegger, in connection with which it was necessary to consider Heidegger's critique of anthropocentrism. His criticism of anthropocentrism is directed against Plato, in whom he sees the forerunner of anthropocentrism. In this regard, Heidegger's argument was shown, his understanding of what the Platonic "idea" is. I compared Heidegger's view with Festugière's, and as a result we got two different interpretations of Platonism.

Starting from this contradiction, I have considered Kant's critique of essentialism against abstract ideas. Methodologically, in the twentieth century, abstract ideas received support precisely from Platonism. The Platonic concept allows one to think about abstractions and generalizations. In my opinion, Platonism is indeed an alternative to anthropocentrism, and this methodology needs to be developed to solve problems, including in the philosophy of ecology.

REFERENCES

1. Bergson, A. (2001). *Creative evolution*. M.: TERRA-Book Club.
2. Chen, T. C. (2021). Application of Sustainable Education Innovation in the Integrated Teaching of Theory and Practice Adopted in the Auto Chassis Course--A Case Study on the Auto Repair Specialty of a Secondary Vocational School in Suzhou, China. *Tobacco Regulatory Science (TRS)*, 7166-7189.
3. Festugiere, A. J. (2009). Contemplation and contemplative life according to Plato. *Saint-Petersburg: Nauka (In Russian)*.
4. Gerdruang, A., Panwatanasakul, C., & Nurnazar, P. (2021). THE DESIRABLE MANAGEMENT OF EDUCATION IN URBANIZATION AREA UNDER THE OFFICE OF NON-FORMAL AND INFORMAL EDUCATION IN BANGKOK THAILAND. *湖南大学学报 (自然科学)*, 48(10).
5. Gerdruang, A., Panwatanasakul, C., & Nurnazar, P. (2021). The Development of Administrators Affiliated with the Office of Non-Formal and Informal Education (NFE). *Review of International Geographical Education Online*, 11(9).
6. Kant, I. (1994). Criticism of Pure Reason. *He Collected works in*, 8(3). M.: Choro.
7. Levina, T. (2013). Transcendental: Plato's anti-aestheticism and ideas "in themselves". In Levina T.V. (Ed.), *Transcendental in modern philosophy: directions and methods*. St. Petersburg: Aleteyya.
8. Levina, T. V. (2014). The world sub specie aeternitatis: about Wittgenstein's Platonism. *Platonov's Research*, No 1.
9. Losev, A.F., & Asmus, V.F. (Eds.). (2007). *Plato* (Works in four volumes). St. Petersburg: Publishing House of St. Petersburg University.
10. Nurnazar, P., & Islambek, S. (2022). HUMANISM OF SOCIOLOGY AND SOCIOLOGY OF HUMANISM. *Uzbek Scholar Journal*, 2, 11-14.
11. Nurnazar, P., & Islambek, S. (2022). HUMANITY AS AN EXPRESSION OF THE SPIRITUAL BEING OF HUMAN. *Uzbek Scholar Journal*, 2, 15-19.
12. Putnam, H. (1998). Realism with a human face. In A.F. Gryaznova (Ed.), *Analytical philosophy: formation and development*. Moscow: House of Intellectual Books, Progress-Tradition.

13. Uli, P. N. R. (2020). Influence of virtual reality on the spirituality of information society. *Евразийский Союз Ученых*, (2-2 (71)), 41-45.
14. Uli, P. N. R. (2021). Development of a Person's Spirituality in Dialogue with Another. *Zien Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 1(1), 133-135.
15. Wittgenstein, L. (2008). *Logico-philosophical treatise*. M.: "Canon +". ROOI "Rehabilitation".