

ECOLOGICAL CULTURE IN THE CONTEXT OF BIOSOCIAL HUMAN EVOLUTION: BIOSOCIOCULTURAL LIMITATIONS AND PROHIBITIONS

Olexandr Koshelev

Melitopol Bohdan Khmelnytsky State Pedagogical University

Annotations:

Кошелєв Олександр. Екологічна культура в контексті біосоціальної еволюції людини: біосоціокультурні обмеження та заборони

Розглянуто теоретичні та практичні аспекти й складові компоненти екологічної культури, її становлення та розвиток у процесі еволюції людини. Проведено аналіз біологічних, соціальних і культурних обмежень і заборон в екологічній етиці та культурі в цілому. Критично розглянуто проблему унікальності людини як біологічного виду та феномена релігійності, його місця й ролі в екологічній культурі сучасного суспільства. Показано, що технічна цивілізація, спрямована на підкорення та знищення природи, призвела до глобальної екологічної кризи й поставила людство на грань вимирання. Визначено, що виживання людства залежить від його здатності засвоїти й виконувати основні екологічні закони та принципи екологічної культури й мислення.

Кошелєв Александр. Экологическая культура в контексте биосоциальной эволюции человека: биосоциокультурные ограничения и запреты

Рассмотрены теоретические и практические аспекты и составные компоненты экологической культуры, ее становление и развитие в процессе эволюции человека. Проведен анализ биологических, социальных и культурных ограничений и запретов в экологической этике и культуре в целом. Критически рассмотрен вопрос уникальности человека как биологического вида и феномена религиозности, его места и роли в экологической культуре современного общества. Показано, что техническая цивилизация, направленная на покорение и уничтожение природы, привела к глобальному экологическому кризису и поставила человечество на грань вымирания. Определено, что выживание человечества зависит от его способности усвоить и выполнять основные экологические законы и принципы экологической культуры и мышления.

Koshelev Olexandr. Ecological culture in the context of biosocial human evolution: biosociocultural limitations and prohibitions

The article deals with theoretical and practical aspects and components of ecological culture, its beginning and development in the process of human evolution. Biological, social and cultural limitations and prohibitions in ecological ethics and culture in whole are analyzed. The critical analysis of the question of uniqueness of a man as a species and of the phenomenon of religiousness, and its place and role in ecological culture in modern society is given. It is shown that technical civilization which is aimed at conquest and destruction of nature led to global ecological crisis and brought humanity to extinction. It is defined that the survival of humanity depends on its ability to master and execute basic ecological laws and principles of ecological culture and thinking.

Key words:

людина, еволюція, екологічна культура, екологічна етика, екологічні проблеми

человек, эволюция, экологическая культура, экологическая этика, экологические проблемы

man, evolution, ecological culture, ecological ethics, ecological problems

Concept "ecological culture" is rather multisided and indistinct. It is defined differently: as "the stage and a component of the development of universal culture characterized by sharp, deep and general awareness of essential importance of environmental problems of the present life and in the future development of humanity" [9, p. 259]; as the norm and an ideal putting ecologically expedient restrictions on the way of human egoism; as the system of knowledge created on the basis of ecological philosophy and imparted from generation to generation, stereotypes of thinking, behaviour, feelings, practical activities, ethical and religious representations (a spiritual component), and also subjects, tools, mechanisms (subject component), connected with relationship of the person and the nature [3, p. 98; 4, p. 188].

The modern person (*Homo sapiens recens*) is considered as the unique subspecies of a special species of animals which passed a long way of biological, and then biosocial evolution [1, p. 30; 6, p. 246; 10, p. 190; 11, p. 15]. Its uniqueness and radical difference from other animal species is seen in the development of brains, mastering the speech, improbable plasticity of the behaviour, possession of fire and difficult technological skills. One can add

the appearing of religious feeling. Among biological features it should be noted vertical position of the body, a biped nature, extraordinary mobility of the top extremities and their manipulative abilities, loss and the reduction of a number of "animal" signs (canines, hair, etc.). The basic principle of biological taxonomy and the variety of life is the recognition of uniqueness of any biological taxon which is genetically unique, represents groups of natural populations of various types and ranks. All the types are also unique in the physiological, ecological and behavioural relation, borrowing, as well as the person, everyone the "an ecological niche". Therefore the degree of this uniqueness should be estimated on the fact how close relatives from among recent types are similar to the person that depends on that, how many sibling species died out earlier.

Morphological, physiological and genetic distinctions between the modern person and large apes are surprisingly small. Behavioural distinctions are more considerable and essential, but the person keeps within the framework of the highest primacies. Paleontological finds of the last years of the new died-out types a hominid (the Flores person, Goliath, etc.) show the existence of intermediate processing methods, the disappeared subsequently. It testifies

to existence at the person of the new direction of evolution – cultural evolution, – during which knowledge and skills are transmitted not through system of genetic mechanisms, and by training and assimilation. Exactly from this point evolution of the person separated from the main course of biological evolution when natural selection began to be supplemented in parallel with process of cultural selection, and in some cases completely to be replaced with it, i.e. possibility of a gene and cultural co-evolution is allowed [11, p. 20].

However many lines of human culture are considered not in total, and separately are found in a rudimentary form and in other animal species. So, separate types make and use tools (the chimpanzee, the crow, Galapagos finches, the digging wasp, etc.). A chimpanzee ability to use a sign language, understanding by them symbols and grammatical structures is studied. "Language" is attached in communication to all animal species, for everyone it is unique as the speech for the person is unique. A number of types (parrots, crows, starlings) are capable not only to imitate the human speech, but to understand separate words and phrases. As well as the person, animals are capable not only to be trained quickly, but also quickly to transfer information, to develop traditions in populations (Japanese macaques, city crows, titmouse, etc.). All this shows that the separate cultural elements meet in various forms among animals, including such concepts as the speech, ability to training, production and use of tools, the politics, the esthetics. Perhaps, their emergence and development in the person went independently from each other during evolution and only at this stage of existence of society is reduced in the general concept "culture".

The aim of this research is to consider formation and a ratio of ecological ethics and ecological culture in the course of evolution of the person; to estimate value of congenital behavioural programs for formation of ecological culture in modern society.

For the person as biological creature the existence of many congenital genetic programs or instincts is characteristic.

The majority of them still absolutely is necessary, including a congenital ban, others weakened or became outdated, and we are compelled to fight with some of them through training and education (for example, aggression). The person has many instinctive ban (for example: don't kill, don't steal, love mother and the father), unlike animals, are weak by nature, easily broken and therefore need a powerful reinforcement through training and religion [7, p. 311]. New useful knowledge is easier and stronger acquired by a brain through ritual and sacral forms, than logically harmonious knowledge.

The biological side of evolution of the person is studied rather fully, thanks to an integrated approach from various sciences (paleontology, anthropology,

primatology, morphology, anatomy, physiology, embryology, genetics, ecology, biogeography). From positions of the epigenetic theory of evolution there is explainable the genetic heritability reflecting certain stages of social evolution of the person. In its genotype are genes of "collector" (they are accurately shown at people collectors), "the great hunter" (at present army of hunters and fishers), "cattle-farmer", "farmer" which are shown at remained 5-10% of people [7, p. 21]. At the others are absent or a weak congenital ban on certain kinds of activity in the nature as heritage of the ancestral form. Therefore such ban should be established through training, acts, religious or ethical standards. For example, for "collectors" of mushrooms, berries and nuts – terms and norms of withdrawal of production, for hunters and fishermen – to establish terms of hunting, norm of production, technique of getting; for cattle-farmers – norm of a pasture of cattle in order to avoid a re-pasture; for farmers – the rules of a crop rotation, use of toxic chemicals and fertilizers etc. Such measures are already known for the early periods of formation of human society.

Rock paintings and archeological finds show ethical and esthetic moments of life of ancient people. The primitive collector, the hunter, the shepherd and the farmer were natural members of ecological systems. Owing to their small number their influence on the nature wasn't still destructive, and they didn't need a ban of the behavior of breaking environment. On the contrary, if they had at that time a strong ban, the person couldn't go on the way of progress.

However it is unlikely between primitive people and the nature there was an idyll, already at that time people faced negative consequences of the impact on the nature. So, specialization of separate tribes served in hunting for mammoths as the reason for their disappearance that led and to a total disappearance of culture of hunters on mammoths. In America the culture of hunters on huge idlers together with disappearance of idlers also breaks. In Europe at the end of the Neolithic era cultures of hunting tribes completely disappear, they are replaced by collectors farmers and the cattle-farmers, arising as though in finished form [1, p. 84; 7, p. 26]. Primitive hunters destroyed the food supply and died out; they were succeeded by farmers-collectors and the real farmers from other places. The unlimited pasture of cattle and burning out of the savanna turned the Middle East and North Africa into the desert, from their numerous inhabitants almost remained nobody, the testimony of former abundance of the nature and prosperity of the person there were only rock paintings.

The lands exhausted and thrown by primitive people meet on all continents, they store only material remains of peculiar cultures, and their inhabitants became victims of the accidents caused by destruction of environment. Those who couldn't

stop in the eco-unfriendly activity perished, and those who didn't bring the environment to catastrophe survived. Probably, a peculiar natural selection among primitive tribes worked, protective mechanisms which changed behavior of population at excessive, dangerous violation of the environment were developed. The love to the nature, pity to animals and plants, aspiration not to destroy more need and not to spoil the nature in vain became one of such mechanisms. Such adaptive behavior was consolidated genetically – as empathy to sufferings of other beings. With it each of us will be born, it is easy to develop and strengthen it at children's age up to an absolute psychological prohibition. But if children see that adults easily break this ban, and at them this feeling becomes deaf.

The primitive person occupied the ecological niche, in ecosystems there were co-adaptation processes with other types [12, p. 296]. At later stages of biosocial evolution of people I went beyond the ecological niche, I got out of the control of natural selection, as led to emergence of anthropogenous ecological crises. With the development of European civilization there was a belief of the person in the forces, inability to fight against the nature, to transform and win against it. The religion, philosophy, science, art cultivated in the person conviction in the exclusiveness, independence by nature. It led to a complete separation of the society and the nature for the millennia. Only in the last centuries became obvious that the person – only one of animal species, and his close relatives – monkeys. And to convince everyone that time came to care of environment, instead of ruthlessly to destroy and submit it, decades though the hidden unconscious protective mechanisms of the person, and not just appeals to reason can come a rescue are required. As the certificate changes in moods of the citizens far by nature, TVs sitting at screens and far penguins worrying nowadays for destiny from them, elephants, and polar bears can serve that. These are echoes and the beginning of awakening of the hidden ecologic-protective instincts.

Already in ancient densely populated agricultural and urban civilizations of Egypt, Mesopotamia, India and China there were cults of sacred plants and animals, prototypes of future zoos, wildlife areas and reserves. Perhaps, they were the first symbols of their high culture and discretion in the relations with the nature. The modern Homo sapiens are born with certain programs of behavior in this world which were created, checked and selected during the long evolution. These ancient instincts are conservative, they don't order, and only direct desires and thoughts, leave to mind a full freedom of action in this or that direction. Therefore, ecological ethics and the ecological culture leaning both on congenital instincts, and on achievements of philosophy, science

and religion are so necessary and important now purposefully imparted through education and training. Today, according to radical ecocentrists and biocentrists, the person, and also different types of plants, animal, their communities, types of ecosystems, biotas and Earth biosphere as whole represent parts of moral community; therefore, the person has direct obligations to the nature. More conservative directions of biocentrism extend the sphere of the moral importance only to the highest animals.

Ecological ethics as system of moral judgments and actions of people in relation to the nature as regards they consider personally and socially worthy, good and correct, and moral reasoning became the most important component of ecological culture which they use for a justification of such judgments and actions; as set of the principles of human thought and the behavior focused on the benefit of complete system "the person – the nature", including plants, animals and ecosystems [4, p. 192; 5, p. 88]. A certain value is gained also by an ecological esthetics as the psychological installation forcing the person to protect the nature because of its beauty.

Ecological ethics were divided into two directions: biocentric and ecocentric. Within the first movement the ethics of life awe by A. Schweitzer (everything is good what is done for the benefit of the separate life, a separate individual) has arisen and is developing. To this direction ethics of ecological virtue, movement of release (rights) of animals, bioethics, and ethics of empathy to the nature, deep ecology, natural ethics, ethics of the wild nature also belong. The ecocentric direction, or ethics of the earth of A. Leopold, recognizes that well everything that becomes for the benefit of an ecosystem, animal species or plants, instead of a separate individual [4, p. 34] it doesn't bear religious loading. The concept of bioregions, O. Kinne's ecoethics, ecofeminism, Gaea hypothesis, ethics of the wild nature also belong to this direction. Ecological ethics in the various forms try to answer the unprecedented challenge, thrown down to mankind which found global ecological domination, having broken laws of ecosystems. The answer consists in expansion of traditional limits of ethics, inclusion in it not only the person, but also all biosphere as a whole, all existing forms of life.

A. Leopold became the pioneer of new views at the end of the 40th years of the XX century. A. Leopold who for the first time has started talking about "ecological conscience", about an urgent task to make the object of public conscience not only people, but also the earth, about need of purposeful ecological education, culture and ethics. Being the leader forester, the hunter and the ecologist in the USA, A. Leopold well understood inertia of human reason and a blindness of the educated and pious

guardians about the nature, the main paradoxes concerning the person to the nature and the split reasons between the person conqueror and the person – the member of a biota. To pass to new ecological views, in his opinion, it is possible only having rejected outdated prejudices about purely economic address with the earth, having paid attention to measures for preservation of integrity, stability and beauty of biotic communities [9, p. 221]. Past decades before ideas and A. Leopold's views were apprehended by society, but they were late behind prompt development of a civilization, deepening of ecological crisis, began to seem too soft and ineffective though demanded sharp transformation of thinking, attachments, feelings and behavior. The understanding of need of more radical ethics which appeared thanks to views A. Neis, the founder of "deep ecology" [4, p. 38 ; 8, p. 644]. Basic provisions of its concept are reduced to the following. At a certain level of a maturity of people begins to identify itself with other living beings, i.e. ecologically to think (that, by the way, was peculiar to ancient people); the person develops the highly moral relation to other types through expansion and deepening of the "I"; the person seeks not to allow a devastation of the planet which inevitably conducts to death of mankind. Love, altruism and compassion – those principles on which strict standards of ecological and nature protection ethics and culture are formed.

Prosperity and the benefit of human and inhuman forms of life on Earth are regarded as valuable in itself. The value of the inhuman world doesn't depend on its advantage for the person. The wealth and a variety of forms of life promotes realization of these values, and people have no moral right to reduce this wealth and a variety, excepting cases of satisfaction of the vital requirements (this principle is postulated in the Convention of preservation of a biodiversity, Rio de Janeiro, 1992). Prosperity of human life and cultures is compatible only with essential decrease of human population (by calculations of ecologists – from recent 7,5 billion people to 0,5-1 billion people) . Present intervention of the person in the nature is too excessively and a situation becomes quickly worse, therefore the policy has to be urgently and cardinally changed through involvement of basic economic, technological and ideological structures. High quality of life which comprises ecologically dependent characteristics has to come out on top in society: average life expectancy, percent of reserved territories in the region, level of available education. The main task is to change paradigm. Today the nature can't be considered only as a source of resources for the person.

The deep ecology isn't reduced to a set of declarative statements. It developed the whole complex of technique, directed on reintegration

of the person to the biosphere and to the ecosystems: transformational rituals, exercises, production of masks, eco-breath, and meditations directed on empathy and the connection with other forms of life. According to its followers , the deep ecology has to become the peculiar social therapy, urged to find the medicine, capable to cure our communications with the whole world.

There was independent direction of bioethics in ecological culture and ethics connected with the person as by a biological being. It was divided into two aspects: medical bioethics which considers questions of the relation to human beings (a problem of abortions, cloning), and actually the bioethics considering the relation of the person to animals or, more widely, to any feeling beings. Supporters of bioethics consider that issue of patents for transgene animals lowers the status of living beings to level of semi-finished products and leads animals to numerous sufferings. Genetic engineering, biotechnology deprive life of its universality, uniqueness and sanctity, reduce all forms of life to level of scraps of information which can be recombined on someone's whim [4, p. 41].

The ethical concept of the bioregion of G. Sneider deserves attention in which the bioregion as the vital territory of various vital forms, with its topography and a biota, manages natural mechanisms, instead of human dictatorship. The Live Ethics calls up with these views and is offered by N. K. Roerich and E. I. Roerich which purpose is preservation and nature restoration ("Earth garden"), spiritual awakening in people of Earth, and also cosmocentrism and teocentrism. According to them the person has no right to solve what has to be the world, valuable in itself; on the contrary, the world decides what a person is to be like. According to a teocentrism, the person is responsible for the destiny of the biosphere before God that stands over the person [8, p. 630].

When we start estimating that means "well", the common sense appears before knot of insoluble contradictions. Is it good for me? For society? For other living being? For the nature? In the latter case it is formal more simply as the nature most often keeps silence, and in it we perceive trouble as a post factum when it becomes bad already to us. Often ethics and the nature act as conflicting parties because moral rushes of certain people and groups of people enter acute contradiction to natural processes, as the result opposite expected turns out. As an example of such situation we will remember winter top dressing of birds. It compels to remain for wintering part of migratory birds that perish later from frosts. Compassionate people arrive is moral ("rescue" hungry birds!), but don't suspect about violation of ecological regularities. Even more sharply such contradiction in case of assistance to baby birds, thrown out from a nest by parents (for example,

at a white stork), eaten by the senior colleagues (cainism) or parents (cronism; it is observed at birds of prey and owls). It is the natural mechanism of demographic character for a number of animal species in the nature, regulation of number according to a condition of food supply. Rescuing such baby birds, the person goes against the nature, violently interferes with operation of these rigid mechanisms.

Supporters of the first actions stand on biocentrism positions (before – "being"), and the second – on positions of ecocentrism or a holism (before – "community"). Ranks of supporters of biocentrism are joined at the expense of inhabitants, and ecocentrists – at the expense of professional ecologists and ecologically educated nonprofessionals. Search of mutual understanding and a compromise between them remains actual and important as will allow to capture the ecological culture with broad masses. The rules of ecology and ethics fixing pragmatics of their discourses are various. The supporters of the different directions of ecoethics which "played one gate", need the search and the development of the general rules. Ecological ethics eat energy of double transgression: the moral interferes in the nature and vice versa. It assumes extrapolation of idea of value of the nature on all areas of modern life: science, art, policy, ideology, economy, language, pedagogy [3, p. 46; 5, p. 110; 8, p. 283].

The mankind is on the threshold of the global ecological crisis able to develop into accident. Disturbing signals of the beginning of destruction of natural systems are distributed even more often more persistently: about pollution and death of oceans and seas, reduction of a biodiversity and exhaustion of bioresources, pollution of the atmosphere and global warming, desertification and deforestation, a smog in the cities, climate change, exhaustion of an ozone layer, an acute shortage of food and fresh water, energy and demographic crises... People are warned for a long time about these consequences and troubles of a technical civilization by fantasts, alarmist and ecologists, but aren't ready to total greening even where there are all prerequisites. Eco-friendly became not up to the end economic, and social prizes weren't balanced on value with the primitive income. Shortage or absence of ecological culture conducts to that ecological threat that is realized far not everywhere and not everything, and, above all – didn't get permission in positive programs of wide scale at the level of the certain countries and the planet in general. The dominant of aspiration of mankind and the certain person is still directed on receiving of the maximum profit. The adopted international Conventions and Agreements directed on preservations of separate components and elements of the biosphere (Antarctica, the atmosphere, the Black Sea, bogs, sea coasts, whales,

migratory birds, bats, etc.) have more often declarative character and are observed only locally.

The general recipes of permission of environmental problems don't exist, continuously arising problems are concrete and interconnected, but insoluble ones don't exist. The technocratic thinking complicates understanding and the solution of many environmental issues and problems therefore development and global introduction of the ecological culture which is under construction on ecological laws and the principles has to become a priority. They are reduced to "deep ecology" or "greening" of ours "I", somehow: there came time to think globally, and to work locally; the person can't live out of the planet, out of the biosphere; the person is a component of the natural or cultivated ecosystems; the person became global destructive force on the planet; a prompt process of global anthropogenous pollution of the environment that threatens mankind of extinction proceeds; each species has the rights, equal with the person, to exist on the planet; process of co-adaptation of the biosphere and mankind proceeds. But it is necessary not only to remember, but also to apply in practice fundamental laws of ecology: everything is connected with everything; everything has to disappear somewhere; the nature knows better; nothing is given by gift [8, p. 315]. Preservation and conservation of nature have to become the main questions of welfare and a condition of survival of mankind. The ecological culture becomes a criterion of realization of intrinsic manifestations of the person in socio-cultural life, its maturity and rationality.

References

1. Alekseev, V. P. (1984). *Evolution of the mankind*. Moscow: Politizdat. [in Russian]
2. *Biological evolution and man*. (1989). (Y.Y. Roginsky, Ed.). Moscow: Publishing house of Moscow State University. [in Russian]
3. Boreyko, V.E. (2001). *Contemporary idea of the wild nature*. Kiev: Publishing House KECC. [in Russian]
4. Boreyko, V. E. (2001). *Break-through into Ecological Ethics*. Kiev: Publishing House KECC. [in Russian]
5. Boreyko, V. E. (2004). *Ecological traditions, religious views of Slavic and other nationalities*. Kiev: Publishing House KECC. [in Russian]
6. Darwin, Ch. (1953). *The Descent of Man*. Moscow: Publishing House Acad. Sc. USSR. [in Russian]
7. Dolnik, V. R. (2003). *The disobedient child of the biosphere*. St. Petersburg: Paritet. [in Russian]
8. Krysachenko, V. S. (1988). *Man and the biosphere: Basics of Ecological Anthropology*. Kyiv: Zapovit. [in Ukrainian]
9. Leopold, O. (1983). *Calendar of Sandy Earldom*. (I.G. Gurova, Trans., A.G. Bannikov, Ed.). Moscow: Mir. [in Russian]
10. Reymers, N. F. (1990). *Nature usage: reference dictionary*. Moscow: Mysl. [in Russian]

11. de Sharden, P. T. (1987). *Phenomenon of Man: selection of essays*. (N. A. Sadovsky, Trans.). Moscow: Nauka. [in Russian]
12. Foley, R. (1990). *One more unique species: ecological aspects of man's evolution*. (E. Z. Godina, Trans.). Moscow: Mir. [in Russian]

Information about the author:

Koshelev Oleksandr Ivanovych

koshelev4@mail.ru

Bohdan Khmelnytsky Melitopol

State Pedagogical University,

20 Lenin Street, Melitopol,

72312, Ukraine

doi:10.7905/vers.v0i2.580

Received at the editors' office: 14.03.2013.

Accepted for publishing: 15.04.2013

Translation: Halyna Matiukha

