



The Philosophical Underpinnings of Human-Nature Interconnectedness

Nde Paul Ade

*University of Bamenda, Bamenda, CAMEROON
Faculty of Arts, Department of Philosophy*

Received: 25 June 2024 ▪ Revised: 18 August 2024 ▪ Accepted: 16 December 2024

Abstract

The relation of man to the physical world, landscape, weather, plants, animals, rocks, seas, mountains, often contribute immensely to humans' health, wellbeing and development at various dimensions. Mankind's connection to nature is steadily and progressively dropping day by day due to numerous human interferences into the natural environment. The crucial role played by this relatedness to nature directly or indirectly, provides suitable livelihood, necessary health benefits and better conditions to people by guaranteeing sustainable terrestrial life and the wellbeing of individuals and groups. This article aims at portraying the growing interests in remedying the perennial problems of mankind, precisely, through the intensification of human relations to nature. It justifies the relationship man shares with nature, and advances evidences whether the human-nature link influences human benefits positively and/or negatively. I demonstrate the manner in which nature transformations and modifications lead to health advantages as well as the satisfaction of individuals and communities. I conclude by portraying the existence of different vital needs of human wellbeing due to humans' interaction and relation to nature: from the relation for consumption of natural food, enjoyment such as spending time in natural environments like the beaches, lakes, parks, forests and zoos.

Keywords: environment, ecological restoration, environmental philosophy, human-nature interconnectedness, perspectives.

1. Introduction

Over the last few years, individual and collective human activities on the physical environment have emerged as an issue of greater concern, discussion and debates in socio-economic discourse and a focal point for scientific research. Addressing issues of such natures is of vital necessity because the quality of soils, water bodies, aquatic inhabitants, including the survival of plants and animals have been deteriorating drastically. A majority of these degrading situations stem from the human societies, especially from Sub-Saharan Africans who persistently change their manner of interference with nature through excessive extraction of natural resources, mining, lumbering, agrarianism, just to name these few. Agriculture is also responsible for extracting vital organisms from nature. So, the direct and indirect forms of extractions cause contamination and decay all provoked by human-nature interactions for decades. Although there exists more ongoing interest in modern agricultural practices in Africa, modern agriculture which also involves the use of chemicals in the production process presents a huge threat to the existence and survival of other species of the ecosystem (Leech, 1996: 4). Leech equally emphasized on the

increase in vegetarianism and demand for chemical farming products to enhance and realize industrial agriculture. It is believed that, the outbreak of different diseases affecting, plants, animals, soils, and biodiversity at large, result from a faulty interaction with, and improper interference into nature.

Humanity is faced with numerous challenges which could mostly be attributed to the activities of the current generation. The future generations may likely experience more damages if stringent measures are not implemented to address human-nature relations crises locally, nationally, and globally. Environmental degradation, excess extraction, exploitation, and destruction still exist, especially in Sub-Saharan Africa, presenting a huge risk to the present and future generations. A clear-cut panacea to these perennial problems is far-fetched as any attempted answer provokes many more questions from the appeal to the expertise of various fields. For instance, traditional ethical theories are insufficient in determining exactly what ought to be done in any given situation concerning environmental problems, as well as the incapability of identifying the best manner of treating the environment, nature, and human relations with them. Therefore, the adoption of very pragmatic environmental perspectives is salutary for the assessment of theories and policies connected to environmental crises of different natures with more emphasis on the contributions of western thinkers to human-nature relationships.

Pragmatic knowledge will certainly influence our actions and understanding of the environment and also in shedding more light on virtue ethics, utilitarianism, and on ethical theories as a whole. People do not emerge from a vacuum, virtue is learned, habituated, acquainted, and it is not necessarily inherent, adding that, “happiness means more than just taking a bottle of beer after a tedious day at work”. In some situations, the greatest good requires individual sacrifice because just considering only an individual is missing a larger part, since the effects of human actions on another may inflict pain or damages nature but is beneficial to the whole. In addition to this, I. Kant (2008) prescribes treatment of one another with respect and dignity, in other words, treating people as an end in themselves and not simply as a means to an end.

2. The philosophical foundations of human-nature relations

The quest for human civilization, the desire to manifest freedom from ignorance, and the eradication of superstitious beliefs that characterized the past, contributed immensely to a redefinition of human-nature relationships. From this perspective, mankind has always attempted to identify their links with the natural environment and nature as a whole, by engaging in various forms of interference and interaction with nature. Human-nature relations in the pre-social context, that is, life before the establishment of civilized societies (the state of nature). The state of nature was regarded as a separate entity and as an opposition to the human society. According to T. Hobbes (2010), human life under such pre-social context was termed “solitary, brutish, poor, nasty, and short”. This negative conception of nature during pre-colonization by Hobbes signaled the flaws of nature and a clear-cut separation between humans and nature. The burning desire to transform and dominate, therefore, took its rise as humans avoided a situation of being dominated by nature through whatever means available. On the other hand, J. Locke (1954) opposed Hobbes’ conception of the state of nature by propounding and attributing a state of “peace, of goodwill, and of mutual assistance and cooperation.” From this Lockean perspective, his viewpoint situates nature as prior to the creation of the modern human societies as quoted by Macnophthen and Urry (1995: 206). These pre-social contributions, among others, were aimed at fulfilling the principal objectives of the Enlightenment, that is, to guarantee human development and liberty which was initially dominated by irrationality and the belief in the superiority of nature over mankind.

Similarly, before the eighteenth century, natural phenomena such as lightening, rainfall, including natural disasters like floods, droughts, earthquakes, etc., were usually

considered as “unknowable mysteries” (Habermas, 1984: 45). Moreover, the animists’ school of thought equally regarded particular aspects of nature which include stars, sun, moon, rivers, mountains, valleys, stars, animals, just to cite these few, as examples of natural aspects possessing spirits. Since these natural aforementioned forms of nature are believed to possess spirits, it rendered them objects of worship and to be worshipped, consequently qualifying them as “Superiors” to mankind. Their superiority to man is further substantiated and justified by their invisible causes which are different from those of humans, coupled with the forces which led to their origins and existence within the natural world as Bratton (1993), Hughes (1993), Berman (1981), indicate. The relation between humans and nature was therefore examined as a far dated issue and one of the most significant, since humans have often interacted with other beings and nature from time immemorial. Even during the pre-Enlightenment, humans were never separated from nature, despite the controversial perspectives of the state of nature proponents like Hobbes (2010) and Locke (1954). So, Man (human) was a part and parcel of nature, given that people were integrated into nature and constituted part of it.

The Enlightenment was impacted by the mutations emerging from debates on the interconnectedness of man and the natural environment, paving the way for the rationalist thinkers like R. Descartes (1837). These rationalists, among others, modified the place of nature by transforming it from a life force to a dead matter-non-living thing as well as changing nature from a “spirit” as initially held, to a “machine”. Descartes’ main reason for subduing matter was an attempt to render humans “masters and possessors of nature” as highlighted by Berman (1981: 25). According to these Enlightenment rationalists, nature can be known, understood, and controlled, by appealing to the scientific method of rational inquiry which involve observation, verification, demonstration, and experimentation (Bohn, 1988: 57-58). The transformation of nature through the use of rational thinking actually replaced some of the characteristics of the past eras such as superstition, dogmas, myths, legends, folklores, and others, thereby paving a smoother path for modernity, defined by Macnaghten and Urry (1995) as: “the belief that, human progress should be measured and evaluated in terms of human domination of nature” (p. 205). From this perspective, the modern era portrays and treats nature as mere matter which should be easily and constantly manipulated for the interests of mankind and for the good of the entire society. This contributed to Utilitarianism, precisely on nature’s purpose that was to be limited by man and meant mainly for what nature could be used for, hereby prioritizing human interests.

3. The status of human-nature egalitarianism

Eco-centric philosophers (Aldo, 1937; Hokhelmer & Adomo, 1943; Luke & White, 1985; Katz, 1992; Light & Katz, 1996; Callicott, 1996; Naess, 2008) firmly believe that, deep ecology completely disagrees with the belief that man is different from all other aspects of the environment in particular and nature as a whole, by propounding a more unified viewpoint. To the ecological egalitarians, the unavoidable link between humans and nature in the biosphere is indispensable and necessary because holistically, humans, animals, plants, etc., possess equal rights to develop and cohabit pacifically. The necessity for propagating equal rights among human and non-human forms of life is also supported by the fact that, both aspects have values in themselves. Hence, the non-human world should not be tampered with for human goals. The wealth and beautiful diversity that characterize nature holistically, contribute positively in attaining varied values and in justifying the real identity of such values. The egalitarians firmly advise that, only in case of satisfaction of very vital and necessary needs should man attempt to extract the richness and diversity offered by nature. Currently, due to the excessive and gross interference of human practices into the non-human world, better situations have been transformed to worse due to human activities like indiscriminate hunting, fishing, lumbering, mining, etc. In order to address this burden properly, a change of mentality and ideologies should be directed mainly toward an appreciation and ethical justification of the quality of life, instead of

prioritizing and succumbing to higher standards of living. Moreover, policies affecting ideologies, economies, and technologies should be different from the present ones which are noted for presenting adverse influences to human-nature relationships as B. Devall & G. Sessions (1985) propagate.

To add, ecology produces wealth and is considered as a simple *modus operandi* in human lifestyles. Emphatically, in a similar light, Naess (2008) assures us that, the value of ecology is a form of philosophy comprising thorough articulated wisdom which constitutes a synthesis involving both theory and practice (pragmatic philosophy). In other words, the active participation of numerous organisms is essential in acknowledging the richness of biodiversity and in guaranteeing a healthier ecosystem. Thus, the involvement of all living things is vital for their own sake and for the good of the ecosystem. All human and non-human life forms, from bacteria in the soil are vital in realizing a smooth functioning of the ecosystem due to their peculiar intrinsic values. Following the varied values examined as contributors to the link between man and nature, it follows that, humans should avoid underestimating the riches and diversity of nature, unless in exceptional cases involving the satisfaction of only vital needs for survival such as; food, shelter, water, among others, being necessary requirements for growth and survival.

Contrarily, it is worth stating that, vital needs vary, depending on the particular place someone lives, it also involves technology, given that certain things solely depend on various sorts of technologies to function well nowadays, which is different from the cases in the past. On the other hand, examples of non-vital needs could be the act of buying a new car, constructing a swimming pool, which are things humans can live without and still survive in today's society. The desire to realize mainly vital needs greatly minimizes our influences and degree of interference into the environment and in nature remarkably. From this perspective, it is important to concur with C. Mechant (1992) by affirming that, humans ought to be positioned as part of nature and are supposed to live pacifically with it and not by always attempting to dominate, suppress, or subdue it. Insistently, she adds:

re-inhabiting the land as 'dwellers in it' rejects industrial society as the world paradigm for development and entails leaving vast tracts of land as wilderness, people can live their lives as 'future primitives' by withdrawing from developed land and allowing it to reestablish itself as wilderness... For each ecological religion, the guideline for use should be human carrying capacity (p. 87).

Irrespective of the fact that statistics indicate an increase in more human interferences into nature and carrying capacity today, resulting from evidences of more occupancy on earth, visible through food shortages, soil degeneration, lack of quality water, among others, humans are hereby called up as dwellers of nature, to manifest a higher sense of responsibility by ensuring that, the numerical value of humans does not in any way affects the local environment in which every society inhabits negatively. It is worth noting that, the reduction of people's ecological consciousness contributes immensely to a drastic drop in our consumptive habits, reduces forms of environmental injustices, water pollution, unfair treatment of minorities and the underprivileged. Therefore, all sorts of negative lifestyles impacting nature should be revisited. Basing on B. Devall's (1988) *Simple in Ideas, Rich in Ends: Practicing Deep Ecology*, in which he advocates for the implementation of new and healthier lifestyles by humans *vis-à-vis* nature. This Devallian view is prompted by the fact that, a majority of humans manifest deviant attitudes from an average behavior expected to be exemplary in the dominant culture (p. 83).

Another solution for a change in mentality about ecological concerns would be the ability to resist advertisements and appeals geared toward more consumption under the pretext of maintaining the economy, or the introduction of "the absence of *novophili*" which Naess defines as, "the love of what is new simply because it is new" (p. 83). So, a more compassionate lifestyle, simplicity which is not attributed to self-denial (alienation) and respect for non-human creatures are recommendable in bridging the gap between humans and non-humans. Similarly, from a

greater extent, nature conservationists, like biologists, consider the adoption of deep ecology as a means to facilitate the selection and designation of barriers and better management strategies of nature reserves, parks, and wild lands (p. 92). Even the impacts of technology on the environment can be easily determined through the introduction of ecological consciousness and ecological restoration. However, given the current state of affairs portraying various varied forms of environmental crises derived from human activities and partly related to the cleaning up of pollution, the act of preserving and conserving rapidly growing habitats, coupled with the endeavor to prevent past mistakes of various natures, the appeal to biotechnology is a panacea in providing a new, effective, and more innovative system that minimizes the level of human interference and impacts on the environment, while addressing other human environmental concerns simultaneously. In addition, biotechnological approach to ecological restoration leads to another method termed “Bioremediation”, considered by Lenhard, Skeen and Brouns (1995) as “the use of microorganisms and other living species to destroy, immobilize, or otherwise transform contaminants to less hazardous forms” (p. 159). Since human activities on the immediate environment and in nature are in most cases considered hostile and unacceptable, irrespective of the reason, the principal preoccupation of environmentalists should focus mostly on ecological restoration. Hence, bioremediation, being one of the newest technologies and most effective method plays a catalyst role in restoring destroyed natural environment by human activities.

4. Challenges and controversies of ecological restoration vis-a-vis human-nature relations

Disappointment and disapproval of the possibility of restoration of nature is justified by A. Light (2000), a non-anthropocentric thinker as he regards it (restoration of nature) as, “a technologically created nature” (p. 56) which is always mistaken for reality. Similarly, our level of technological fitness and advancement is a clear reflection of human arrogance and dominance over other aspects of nature, fabricated by man as a means to monitor and impact the natural world and life. Also, the desire to recreate nature as a restoration goal is considered as an artifact meant for human purposes which eventually results to less inherent value. A radical interruption in the natural processes of nature is produced with the intention of redesigning, recreating, and restoring the natural events, giving more room for manipulation, domination, imposition of human interests, and restricting nature from taking its original course. From this perspective, the real values of the original aspects of nature do not need preservation as a possible remedy to render worse situations better, since humans constantly use, always destroy, degrade, and replace natural entities at will, regardless of taking moral impacts into account (Katz, 1992: 56-57).

Moreover, D. Scherer (1995) believes that, the historical continuity of the environment is usually disrupted by humans through intervention and interference, adding that, the real worth of natural land created naturally, is worth more value than human created land and man-made nature (pp. 359-379). Moreover, the intrinsic value of nature focuses on the richness and diversity of nature, but not limited to its historical continuity. However, historical continuity should simply be a catalyst in signaling warnings in case of future problems that could influence the richness and diverse nature of a particular area. In addition to the challenges of restoration, newly restored areas are more vulnerable and unnatural, compared to old areas which possessed originality, authenticity, uniqueness, due to natural adaptations derived from organisms found in the environment. Given that human arrogance is primordially responsible for various environmental damages today, emphasis on bioremediation which recognizes past mistakes serves as a form of apology of man towards nature. So doing, man is bound to develop the tendency of learning from errors in order to achieve a higher level of tolerance and humility towards non-humans/inanimate forms of nature.

That notwithstanding, nature merits self-value and even the highest value, which should not be destroyed by human intervention as Katz (1992: 231-241) suggests in relation to restoration as: that which man created in order to satisfy human interests and not for the sake of the environment itself. Naturally, nature is the author of the natural environment that humans perpetually contaminated, destroyed, and reshaped. Since the natural environment was already created naturally, it follows that, no human has the power to create it a second time. This justifies why objects of human creation such as cars, houses, dresses, among many others, involving human intelligence and ingenuity do not exist naturally. Another typical example of ecological restoration is the act of considering an old car that is affected by rust, causing the engine to no longer function. If someone buys the old car and reshapes it to look original, will the buyer conclude that he created the car? Certainly no, because from this case, the car was simply restored and not created which is similar to issues of ecological restoration.

Again, man's domination of nature is aggravated by ecological restoration forcing nature to satisfy his best interests by using every available opportunity to play the role of a suppressor, dominator, and exploiter as is usually the case, hereby insinuating that, humans do not seem to be restoring nature at all. An example of real human-nature dominance would have been geared toward the transformation of the environment to prevent continuous contamination which is not restoration by leaving contaminated areas, as well as adopting only technologies that cannot affect the survival of species on earth negatively. Another possible constraint of applying ecological restoration is that, it can easily lead to a slippery slope based on the belief according to which, if the previous natural environment is effectively replaceable, then, it will present a golden opportunity for humans to keep on toying with nature, having in mind that nature is a replaceable entity that does not deserve any moral considerations. To further support the dangers of restoration, M. Bookchin (2008) states that, "our ecological problems derive their origins in the society and from social problems" by emphasizing that, deep ecological practices have limited humans from social beings to mere species when he writes: "we are already living in a period of massive de-individuation, it is not de-individuation that the oppressed of the world require, but re-individuation that will transform them into active agents in the task of remaking society" (pp. 246-247).

From a more developed context, even AIDS, Smallpox, Chickenpox, and other harmful microbes constitute part of the whole interrelated ecosystem equally having same intrinsic value like humans do. Though the principal difference lies on the basis that, humans exclude themselves from nature by fighting diseases through the use of anti-bacterial products, building tight houses, irrespective of the fact that they are not the only inhabitants or occupants of the same house, are all regarded as a solution to self-preservation. Microorganisms in general are vital agents for the smooth functioning of the ecosystem, though their significance is always underestimated, neglected, and morally unconsidered. Given that humans are also a constituent of the environment just like non-human species, it is practically complex to exclude humans from the space they occupy with others in the same environment, not leaving out the connection and perception of things, although humans have usually tended separating from wild animals. To buttress this statement, M. Bookchin (2003) states:

Perhaps the most obvious of our systematic problems is uncontrollable growth. The growth of which I speak is not humanity's colonization of the planet over millennia of history. It is rather an inexorable material reality that is unique to our era: namely, that unlimited economic growth is assumed to be evidence of human progress. We have taken this notion so much for granted over the past few generations that it is as immutably fixed in our consciousness as the sanctity of property itself (p. 43).

Moreover, the reliance on bioremediation is beneficial in attaining environmental sustainability, non-artificiality, and noninvasiveness. Thus, without the implementation of true restoration, it will be time consuming allowing contaminated land to restore themselves like

before. Even environmental pragmatists like K. Parker (1996) firmly holds the view according to which, people are inseparable from the environment, they are interrelated and are part of it “mind is not apart from the world; it is a part of the world...the environment is above all not ‘something out there’, somehow separate from us, standing ready to be used up or preserved as we deem necessary” (p. 28). In a similar vein, it is worth stating that, ecosystems are constantly undergoing change (dynamic) in nature. Due to their mobile character, pragmatists therefore believe that, reality is a stage of growth, while qualifying beings as relationally defined areas of meaning and not merely as individual elements standing with others in the natural and human world. Therefore, despite the geometrical progress in technology so far, without the environment and human experiences, everything ceases to exist as A. Weston (1996) writes: “Things are valuable in their contexts, with it being foolish and philosophically confused to try to value them outside of their contexts” (p. 285).

5. Prospects: Re-visioning human-nature relationship

Until recently, the physical environment or nature as a whole, being what humans in particular and the society existing within has been taken for granted in the domain of social theory. This is evident from the separate treatment of the “natural” and the “social” contexts. Numerous threats and damages on the natural environment have been a reality over the last few decades, leading to the creation of more awareness about the prevention and/or control of harmful impacts on nature and the rigorous and endless desire for survival and sustainability. However, the attempt to seek possible solutions leads to more questions and doubts provoked by the continuous exploitation and interference into nature by humans, not leaving out the extent to which nature will continue to bear such exploitations. Therefore, in face of this evolving social concern linked to an imminent environmental crisis, the idea of neglecting human-nature relations becomes unavoidable as revealed by Ferre (1996), including Luke and White (1985). Nonetheless, this burden has led to the emergence of new theories, ideas, and orientations, geared at understanding and intensifying the attention on the importance of seeking better and more effective solutions, through an evaluation and thorough investigation on human-nature relations holistically (Morrison, 1986; Magnaghten & Urry, 1995; Foster, 1995).

Focusing on the social, political, philosophical, and scientific concerns of environmental/natural links between nature and humans/social is still an issue of ongoing interest and debates. For instance, disagreements, misconceptions and misinterpretations still exist among policy makers, environmental activists and scientists concerning the intensity and pace of environmental hazards. Despite the differences, one common ground held by various schools of thought is the fact that, erroneous human-nature relations are accountable for environmental crises of varied natures experienced today. This erroneous interference has been attributed to pressure from modernity and capitalism, which retard compromise and gears at drawing a consensual conclusion to correct or transform human faults to possible solutions (Aldo, 1937; Hokhelmer & Adomo, 1943; Nash, 1967; Bookchin, 1990a). Despite the absence of a consensus from environmental ethics and norms regarding human-nature crisis, there has been progress though relatively low (Armstrong & Botzier, 1993).

A form of modern environmental ethics expected to reflect the characteristics of modernity such as “homo-centrism” should be implemented as a spearheading paradigm, charged with the provision of vital information on human-nature links in every aspect of societal life. Also, Utilitarian ethics should focus more on tackling issues prioritizing human-nature welfare, as well as to critically scrutinize the features of good human actions *vis-à-vis* nature, since nature comprises an enormous landscape embedded with diverse vital credentials for humans. Again, the use of non-human creatures and forms of life such as animals should be conditioned and limited only for the satisfaction of vital desires for man’s existence and survival, such as for food and

shelter. Too, an appeal for human-nature conservationism is a salutary initiative that portrays compassion and concern for environmental deterioration. Similarly, the aspects of nature possessing economic values should be encouraged, preserved, protected, and given the widest possible support to hold common grounds with ecological restoration as propagated by conservationists such as Rousso-poulous (1993) who affirm that, “human-nature connection focuses on cost and benefit justifications to unveil modern human-centered rationalism” (pp. 285-286).

Furthermore, the preservation of the natural environment is significant and necessary, since nature is viewed as an ecosystem. Here, the extraction from nature for economic gains becomes a problematic issue. In order to ensure and enhance the continuous survival of a variety of non-human species, and the maintenance of the beautiful natural environment with all its natural endowments and particularities, adopting an ethical standpoint for the protection of nature for current glorification and appraisal or for future use is beneficial. If preservation is prioritized, then, in future, the importance of having preserved the ecosystem and its natural values will be more appreciated (Rolston, 1988: 111). A typical example is the practice of preserving plants today for future curative or medicinal values. Still, Policy-makers, stakeholders, Non-Governmental Organizations, Food and Agricultural Organization, should intensify reactions in various ways by providing public awareness on the values of the survival of useful organisms and other forms of life. This strategy involving sensitization on the vital role of nature to mankind, is gradually yielding fruits as African countries are being educated and sensitized to avoid the use of chemicals and actions that are detrimental to their environments. Finally, the provision of grants, sponsoring of scientific research related to the sources, nature, gravity, and values of environmental concerns should be facilitated in realizing more reliable and sound decisions related to ecological preservation and restoration. Various countries should intensify a more holistic and interactional means to moderate human-nature relations and spare the destruction of the natural world from extinction.

6. Conclusion

Globally, several governments are less worried about environmental education, political leaders are too tolerant by permitting the construction of houses in non-constructible areas which leads to countless deadly cases of landslides such as the cases of South Africa, after three days of heavy rainfall in April 2022, Nguouache landslide in Cameroon on 29 October 2019 and the most recent, the Mbankolo landslide in Cameroon of 8 October 2023, among others. The Anthropocene period has described humans as the principal geophysical force, possessing a praxeological role that gives them the power to modify and artificialize the environment and nature as they wish. Provoked by anthropocentrism and technological advancements, human actions towards the environment have triggered environmental crises of varied natures whose impacts are evident on a global context: climate change, extinction of species, natural disasters, degradation of ecosystems and biodiversity, pollution of the biosphere, drying up of natural lakes (for example Lake Chad), depletion of underground water level, sewage spills, shrinking of the ozone layer, over exploitation and use of water resources, soil degradation, among others. Currently, the epistemological discourse on the subject matter at stake is needs to be revisited and renewed, by extending its focus from an anthropocentric perspective to an ecocentric point of view, which paves the possibility of addressing the Cartesian technoprogressive utopia positioning humans as “Master and possessor of nature.” In a similar manner, the French philosopher and anthropo-sociologist Edgar Morin has developed an “ecologised way of thinking” based on three major pillars: First, the reintegration of our environment into our anthropological and social consciousness, second, the ecosystematic resurrection of the idea of nature and third, the decisive contribution of the biosphere to our planetary consciousness

Therefore, propagating theories and research based on a better understanding of ourselves, from the historical, cultural, political, and social contexts will eventually guarantee environmental sustainability, nature preservation and conservation. The urgent and perpetual quest for remediation of conflicts in this complex and dynamic world, paves the way for the introduction and intensification of environmental philosophy, social and political philosophy, which place humanity and democratic concerns at the forefront of social programs and policies. Given that experiences and nature differ from social and ecological realities, therefore, various situations require different peculiar remedies to environmental problems. The environment and nature deserve to be well taken care of, irrespective of the person or organ in charge. Therefore, humans are obligated to serve as catalyst by saving nature from extinction. If humans fail in this significant task of cohabiting tolerantly, accommodatingly, empathically and pacifically with nature, then, we (humans) should be held accountable for destroying what was meant to be preserved, protected, and saved especially for future generations.

Acknowledgements

This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

The author declares no competing interests.

References

- Armstrong, S. I., & Botzler, R. G. (1993). *Environmental ethics: Divergence and convergence*. New York, McGraw-Hill.
- Berman, M. (1981). *The re-enchantment of the World*. London, Cornell University Press.
- Bookchin, M. (1990a). *Remaking society: Pathways to a green future*. Boston, South End Press.
- Bookchin, M. (1990b). *The Philosophy of Social Ecology: Essays in Dialectical Naturalism*, Montreal, Black Rose Books.
- Bookchin, M. (2003). Death of a Small Planet: Its Growth That's Killing Us. Institute for Social Ecology, <http://www.socielecology.org/article.php?story=20031117103522543> (accessed April 26, 2024).
- Bookchin, M. (2008). Social ecology versus deep ecology. *Environmental Ethics: Readings in Theory and Application*, United States.
- Bratton, S. P. (1993). Christian ecotheology and the Old Testament. *Environmental Ethics: Divergence and Convergence*. New York, McGraw-Hill.
- Callicott, J. B. (1996). How environmental ethical theory may be put into practice. *Ethics and Environment*, 1(1), 3-14.
- Descartes, R. (1837). *Discourse on the method of rightly conducting the reason*, translated by John Veitch. Edinburgh, William Blackwood & Sons.
- Devall, B., & Sessions, G. (1985). *Deep ecology*. Salt Lake City, Peregrine Books.
- Devall, B. (1988). *Simple in means, rich in ends: Practicing deep ecology*. Salt Lake City, Peregrine Smith Books.
- Ferre, F. (1996). Persons in nature: Toward an applicable and unified environmental ethics. *Ethics and Environment*, 1, 15-25.
- Habermas, J. (1981a). Modernity versus postmodernity. *New German Critique*, 22, 3-14.

- Habermas, J. (1984). *The theory of communicative action*. Boston, Free Press.
- Hobbes, T. (2010). *Leviathan*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Hughes, J. D. (1993). The Ancient Roots of our Ecological Crisis. In *Environmental Ethics: Divergence and Convergence*. New York, McGraw-Hill.
- Kant, I. (2008). Rational beings alone have moral worth. In *Environmental Ethics: Readings in Theory and Application*, United States, Thomson Wadsworth.
- Katz, E. (1992). The big lie: Human restoration of nature. *Research in Philosophy and Technology*, 12, 231-242.
- Leech, C. (1996). Mad cows shake up British agriculture. *Alternative Journal*, 22(4).
- Lenhard, R. J., Skeen, R. S., & Brouns, T. M. (1995). Contaminants at US DOE sites and their susceptibility to bioremediation. *Bioremediation: Science and Application*, SSSA Special Publication, 43, Madison.
- Light, A., & Katz, E. (1996). Environmental pragmatism and environmental ethics as contested terrain. In *Environmental Pragmatism*. New York, Routledge.
- Light, A., & Katz, E. (Eds.) (1996). Beyond intrinsic value: Pragmatism in environmental ethics. In *Environmental Pragmatism*. New York, Routledge.
- Light, A. (2000). Ecological restoration and the culture of nature: A pragmatic perspective. In *Restoring Nature: Perspectives from the Social Sciences and Humanities*. Washington, Island Press, pp. 56-57.
- Locke, J. (1954). *Essays on the law of nature*. Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Macnaghten, P., & Urry, J. (1995). Towards a sociology of nature. *Sociology*, 29(2), 203-221.
- Mechant, C. (1992). *Radical ecology: The search for a livable world*. New York, Routledge.
- Morin, E. (2007). *L'an I de l'ere Ecologique*, Paris, Tallandier.
- Naess, A. (2008). Ecosophy: Deep versus shallow ecology. *Environmental Ethics: Readings in Theory and Application*. Unites States, Thomson Wardsworth.
- Parker, K. (1996). Pragmatism and environmental thought. In *Environmental Pragmatism*. New York, Routledge.
- Rolston, H. (1993). Values gone wild. In *Environmental Ethics: Divergence and Convergence*. New York, McGraw-Hill.
- Roussopoulous, D. I. (1993). *Political ecology*. New York, Black Rose Books.
- Scherer, D. (1995). The practice of ecological restoration. *Environmental Ethics*, 17, 359-380.
- West, A. (1996). Before environmental ethics. In *Environmental Pragmatism*. New York, Routledge.

