

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 3.117
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHHI (Russia) = 0.156
ESJI (KZ) = 8.716
SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

SOI: [1.1/TAS](#) DOI: [10.15863/TAS](#)

International Scientific Journal Theoretical & Applied Science

p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online)

Year: 2019 Issue: 06 Volume: 74

Published: 30.06.2019 <http://T-Science.org>

QR – Issue



QR – Article



Zarina Amirovna Abduazimova
National University of Uzbekistan
Basic doctoral student

UDC 17.0

THE MODERN WORLD AND THE PROBLEMS OF ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS

Abstract: Environmental ethics is an area of philosophical research, the subject of which is the substantiation and development of ethical principles and norms governing relations between people in the process of their interaction with nature. It is called in the foreseeable future to change the value priorities of the development of mankind. The initial stage of the formation of environmental ethics is the environmental code. Environmental ethics is based on universal and universal human values and is an integral part of global morality. Modern society is facing a fundamentally important choice: to preserve the existing way of interacting with nature, which will most likely cause a global ecological catastrophe, or change its perception and ways of interacting with nature in order to preserve the biosphere. The right choice is possible only in the conditions of a radical restructuring of the people's world outlook, a change in customary values, and an increase in the importance of spiritual culture, including ecological culture.

Key words: Ecology, morality, biosphere values, culture, activity, spirituality education, morality, code. Norms, standards of society, psychology, emotionality, states. Globalization, problems of morality, practice, research results.

Language: English

Citation: Abduazimova, Z. A. (2019). The modern world and the problems of environmental ethics. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 06 (74), 633-637.

Soi: <http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-06-74-78> **Doi:**  <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2019.06.74.78>

Introduction.

Today we clearly understand that ecological culture is an integral part of the life of society, which creates a framework of morality in the sphere of human influence on the natural environment, and also forms the means of spiritual and practical development of nature. The essence of ecological culture, according to B.T Likhachev, lies in the unity of the developed consciousness, emotional and mental states and scientifically based volitional utilitarian-practical activities in the field of ecology. Within the framework of ecological culture, new views and approaches are being formed to preserve and restore a previously created cultural human environment, including all spheres of social life. Thus, ecological culture is one of the spiritual and moral spheres of human life, which characterizes variants of its interaction with nature and includes a system of interrelated elements: ecological consciousness, ecological attitude and ecological activity. Habitat changes were mostly local in nature and evaluated from a pragmatic point of view. In our time, the proliferation of environmental crisis trends has led many researchers to abandon anthropocentric ethics

and look for opportunities to include nature in the sphere of human responsibility. In this regard, questions have arisen about the sources, basic principles and norms of environmental ethics, and this means the need to address an issue that has a long history but has not received an unequivocal solution: how to understand good and evil in relation to the outside human sphere.

In different traditional cultures, this issue was resolved in different ways, so many authors raise the question of the relationship of environmental ethics with culture, worldview and science. At the same time, a number of authors believe that there is no need to create special ecological ethics, since it is enough just to get rid of some extremes of the former anthropocentric ethics, assuming that natural processes do not have to be in the service of a person and that care should be taken in dealing with them. , care and skill. And this is the task of science, technology and economic analysis of costs and profits. In turn, other authors believe that the destructive consequences of modern technical and economic practice have reached such a scale that it is necessary to impose restrictions on some of its types and

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 3.117	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 0.829	PIHHI (Russia)	= 0.156	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.716	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 5.667	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

prohibitions on others. In other words, in the field of ecology, it is necessary to develop a system of fundamental laws similar to the biblical ten commandments.

The development of modern ecology as a special system of knowledge about the nature of the interaction of human communities with the surrounding natural environment has passed a difficult path from a rigorous factual study of the negative effects of the exponential growth of industrial and industrial production and the search for local technical and technological ways out of the ecological crisis to the realization of the need to adopt a common civilizational, global ecological path of behavior in relation to nature. It assumes the characteristic work of maintaining the emerging structures of the new mentality and new moral-ecological imperatives and ideals. The cultivation of the moral content of ecological globalism is the most important task of the current stage of its development. What is the essence of this content and how did it manifest itself as environmental issues develop.

The ethical problems of the modern world, which goes back to the global society by the “steps” of a market economy, are complex and multifaceted. This is particularly pronounced at the turn of the millennium, since the socioeconomic, scientific and technological development of a planetary civilization is becoming more complex, leading to transformation in the natural-biological environment. All these complex interweaving together form the social and technological development of the world, at the “edge” of which time there are questions about the possibility of harmonious to the evolutionary socio-natural development and the development of humane global ethics. The social and philosophical justification of the need to form a world ethic of responsibility is an integral part of the ethics of morals. Within the framework of a narrow sociological approach, social reality and the ethics associated with it are considered in the context of the complication of social relations. The socio-philosophical approach explores social evolution extensively, in conjunction with natural-biological and man-made changes in the biosphere and man. In reality, the emergence of a reality created by the society, filled with myriads of artificial substances and objects, transforming the way affects the life of the society itself and the biosphere nature, leads to the spread of technologically modified living organisms and the growing ecological crisis.

Review literature.

New humanism - humanistic ethics should be implemented to the same extent in relation to nature as in interpersonal relationships, demanding that a person show Love, Respect and Responsibility to the whole natural world. The ability of a person to abandon his own anthropocentrism and begin to live in the interests of the Other is the manifestation of the

genuine, “humane” humanism. The eco-ethics problem of natural values is debatable: should the independence and intrinsic value of natural objects be recognized, or is their value determined depending on the person, his needs and interests? This question is not a theoretical scholastic, but a practical one, on it in eco-ethics is built the whole building of the equal rights of a living person to life and compassion. Some environmentalists (Prof. N. N. Marfenin, Moscow State University) [1] believe that “not a single living being, except man, possesses the “intrinsic value” of itself”, citing as an argument the lack of interests and desires of natural objects, will (which, by the way, is not indisputable). This would be fair if it were about the realization of this intrinsic value (it really cannot be), but it is about something else: its objective presence or absence, regardless of its awareness. This person should be aware that the grass has or can have (not recognized by itself) the will and desire for life, well-being (sun and heat), etc., and act in accordance with this recognition. Therefore, we stand on the point of view that ecosystems should be recognized as independent moral subjects that have intrinsic value. And the point is not whether they are able to realize their intrinsic value - the baby doesn't realize it either, but because of this his life does not cease to be self-valuable: we are able and obliged to realize it for him. Therefore, a person does not have the right to decide from the position of benefit and expediency the question of the value or right to life of one or another type; It should take care of the conservation of all species and objects of nature, avoiding losses in biodiversity. Thus, eco-ethics imposes a normative-moral moratorium on the treatment of nature as a thing and a resource, and therefore only the intrinsic value of natural systems can be the basis of modern eco-ethics.

It is obvious that exclusively human-centric goals can no longer remain the only principle of the ecobiopolitics of mankind. Therefore, the solution of the problem of nature's intrinsic value runs along the line of the divide between anthropocentrism and non-anthropocentrism — fundamental alternative positions that determine the theoretical content and practical style of the relationship between man and nature. At the same time, a non-anthropocentric approach does not reduce the role and value of a person, but instead puts forward a harmonious and equal community of people and all other components of nature as the highest level in the scale of values. One of the manifestations of the non-anthropocentric approach is the moral-understanding relationship to nature (the term of V. A. Petritsky) [2], which manifests itself in an effort to “spiritualize” and understand the Living, up to the interpenetration in his feelings and experiences. For such a co-feeling, co-suffering, it is necessary for the Living - the “non-human” subject to be recognized as a source of relationships equal to the human subject. Such an

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 3.117	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 0.829	PIHHI (Russia)	= 0.156	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.716	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 5.667	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

attitude to nature is possible only when establishing a subject-subject relationship between man and nature, when the world of natural phenomena is perceived by man as "his Other", as Other subject, Other thinking creature or social organism (idea V. I. Falco). Principle subject - the subject relationship of man and nature determines and makes possible the formation of moral values of eco-ethics around two rods: feelings of love and compassion for nature and feelings of time involving the care of natural conditions exist future generations (O. Leopold) [3]. Turning to the future, in turn, is based on a number of specific moral principles, norms and values that should underlie our obligations to future generations. These are: the principle of chronological objectivity, which prohibits ignoring the interests of individuals due to their temporary, spatial or ideological distance; "Duty to descendants" who have specific rights in relation to us; norms-imperatives of dialogue with the future, including the need to abandon any action that could undermine the possibility of existence or the interests of future generations. Compliance with all these principles is possible only in the conditions of moral and environmental freedom and responsibility, the ratio of which is determined by the degree of knowledge of social and natural laws and the possibility of mastering and "manipulating" them. Obviously, moral and ecological freedom depends on taking into account and observing the fundamental tenets of moral and ecological responsibility, which include: the transition from the "model of the predominance" of man over nature to the "model of coexistence" of man and nature; adoption of a new concept of environmental protection is not so much for a person as for a person; control of the "animal" that is inside us; "Reconciliation" of the economy and production with the environment based on moral criteria. The considered principles, norms and imperatives may well, in our opinion, lay claim to the role of conceptual foundations of environmental ethics [4]. Of course, they are far from indisputable, but their recognition and implementation would contribute to the process of ecologization of morality, which is necessary in the context of modern ecobiopolitics.

Philosophical understanding of environmental problems in the conditions of scientific and technological progress has been deeply reflected in the work of the members of the "Rome Club". But now the time has come for a concrete natural-science solution of environmental problems. And what is interesting, working out a strategy for solving the issues that have arisen, Academician NN Moiseev, a representative of exact natural science, rose, like V.I. Vernadsky in his time, [5] to a deep philosophical understanding of the situation and ways out of it. "Unlike the principle" do not kill! ", He writes, "environmental principles will change along with the development of technology and technology, as

resources are exhausted and, possibly, as a result of a complete restructuring of the entire technological basis of our civilization. People will have to reckon with this and learn to measure their actions, their desires and goals with environmental principles. There is a kind of "environmental imperative." Science must formulate it, and people must accept it. It is in this latter that I see the main difficulty in ensuring the co-evolution of man and the biosphere. " And further: "The ability to properly use and regulate the power of modern society means" ecological culture "and" ecological thinking ".

The need for the ecological and ethical regulation of social relations is determined by a number of practical demands and needs of the global and regional (local) levels. The basic theoretical principles of eco-ethics regulative are: the principle of the subject-subject relations of man and nature, "reverence for life" by A. Schweitzer, the "ecological imperative" by N. Moiseev. They are the conceptual foundations of environmental ethics and imply a transition from anthropocentrism to a non-anthropocentric paradigm, recognition of the intrinsic value of natural systems, a moral-understanding attitude to nature, "turning to the future", designed to ensure the process of ecologization of morality.

Results.

In the field of nature management, there are ideas that are quite common for all about the moral environment: nature is our mother, our common wealth; we must take care of it both for ourselves and for all; do not spoil, do not break the green spaces in the city; all who break them and pollute nature are immoral; committing environmental crimes should be punished to the fullest extent of the law and it is still insufficient. Realizing the responsibility for the fate of nature, humanity is concerned about the problems generated by modern civilization. A special place among them is environmental problems. The surrounding nature is almost completely involved in the life support of a person who exploits all ecosystems. The idea of the unlimited resources of the biosphere and the independent activity of man from the environment turned out to be untenable. Irreplaceable resources of the subsoil are depleted, clean water reserves are reduced, many pollutants are not included in the natural circulation and accumulate in the biosphere, worsening the state of living organisms. Degradation is due to the weakening of the moral imperatives of human activity. To preserve the biosphere of traditional measures to improve environmental management, the assimilation and deepening of ecological knowledge is not enough. It is possible to overcome the current situation by enriching the moral and aesthetic potential of a person. In this regard, modern pedagogical science pays special attention to improving the system of environmental education and upbringing,

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 3.117	SIS (USA) = 0.912	ICV (Poland) = 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829	PIHHI (Russia) = 0.156	PIF (India) = 1.940
GIF (Australia) = 0.564	ESJI (KZ) = 8.716	IBI (India) = 4.260
JIF = 1.500	SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667	OAJI (USA) = 0.350

environmental awareness, environmental performance and environmental culture in general. Efficient organization of the process of forming an ecological culture will enhance the basic ecological knowledge, determine the ecological world outlook and develop the need for relevant activities in the development of nature and the use of natural resources. The environmental component of the content of the educational process contributes to the formation of new relations in the man-nature system.

Anthology of environmental ethics.

Environmental ethics today covers a variety of, not necessarily related areas, its anthology includes:

Animal rights. Ethics of the Earth. Ecofeminism. Deep ecology. Surface ecology. The rights of geo-objects (rocks, valleys) and so on. Bioethics. We are trying to formulate the principles of ecological ideology. First of all, it is taking into account in all spheres of human activity the reaction of the natural environment to the changes made to it, activity not instead of nature, breaking its circulation of substances, trophic levels and destroying its constituent parts, but activity together with nature taking into account its capabilities and laws of functioning. This principle of activity gets its legal continuation in the concept of the rights of nature, which is currently being intensively discussed. It is based on the idea of the equivalence of all forms of life, regardless of the obvious differences in the complexity of the structure and levels of the organization. Man from the "crown of nature", which he worshiped from the Renaissance, is transformed into one of the types that have no value advantages over others. Eccentricity is replacing anthropocentrism.

The global problems of our time require an immediate rethinking of the installation historically formed in the human consciousness, aimed at the consumer, destructive and in many cases destroying the attitude of man to nature.

In the modern world against the background of thoughtless attitude to their own lives and those around us, when millions of living beings are annihilated unnecessarily, the deeply moral principle of sustainable development, which satisfies the needs of the present time, but does not compromise the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. A.A. Skvortsov describes four types of relations between man and nature, which have been observed during the whole time of their interaction.

The first type is an immoral, evil attitude. It is quite rare (arson of the forest for fun, killing animals and deforestation in order to demonstrate their strength, etc.).

The second type is the utilitarian attitude, the most common at the present time. It is typical for him to see in nature only the resources necessary to maintain well-being.

The third type is the relation to nature: theoretical, scientific, opposing a purely utilitarian one. A real scientist doesn't care about what benefit knowledge will bring him, his task is to search for objective laws of nature, unshakable foundations on which the whole universe rests.

The fourth type is an aesthetic attitude.

However, A. A. Skvortsov considers the first and second types of relations to be inadmissible, and the third and fourth ones to be insufficient. The most accurate formulation of the only decent attitude of man to nature is the affirmation of the human principle in space and cosmic in man.

Ethics, which mixes fact and value, nature and concept of nature, nature and thinking about nature, do not meet the basic requirements of the rationality of terms. Such ethics seeks its foundations in nature, thereby ceasing to be ethics. Empirical (ecological) realities keep consciousness in the grip of a poorly organized language: we consider moral not the sphere of due, but the sphere useful for our survival, which has nothing to do with morality. Ecological ethics speaks about the facts of nature with the facts of ecology (giving them the status of values), ignoring the facts of the soul, consciousness, spirit.

Acquisition of clarity in the vision of nature is the leitmotif of philosophy, which provokes self-reflection, finally born, left the maternal bosom, and therefore capable of becoming as a person, distinguishing you and You, I and I. Distinction presupposes transcendence, and it is unconditional the ethics of an act having the force of an apodictic-practical principle.

References.

General environmental education for sustainable development is a modern stage in the development of environmental education, based on the values of sustainable (balanced, harmonious) development of nature and society; the philosophical-political strategy of education for sustainable development; theoretical foundations of the formation of a postindustrial society, reflected in the concept of the federal state educational standards of the new generation. General environmental education is humanitarian-natural science education aimed at developing an ecosystem cognitive model for students as the basis for the development of environmental thinking, environmental literacy, and its creative application to accumulate personal and joint experience of reflexive-evaluative and project-oriented activities of environmental ethics and sustainable development - as a condition for the development of the citizen's environmental culture, his responsible attitude to the observance of legal and moral standards in the field of environmental protection, health and safety of life. The content presented in the subject-activity form is paramount. The substantive component of the content is represented by scientific knowledge about

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 3.117	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 0.829	PIHHI (Russia)	= 0.156	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.716	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 5.667	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

environmental relations and relations in the “man-society-nature” system, their contradictions, laws, theories and development models; environmental ethical and legal regulations; historical experience of ecological culture of different times and kinds; environmental issues in art, fiction, philosophy, traditional religions, project culture, technology - that is, the environmental component of the various elements of human culture. Activity means of

familiarizing students with the ecological culture of mankind and the development of ecological thinking in a person; environmental awareness; environmental preparedness for social activities - advocating the development of an ecology-specific cognitive model; reflexive-evaluative actions to determine the personal meaning of moral, legal and environmental imperatives; ways of environmentally oriented project activities.

References:

1. Marfenin, N. N. (2007). *Ecology and ethics // Russia in the outside world: 2006* (Analytical Yearbook). (p.172). Moscow: MNEPU-Avant.
2. Leopold, O. (1983). *Calendar sandy county*. Moscow: Mir.
3. Petritsky, V. A. (1990). Ecologization of Morals and Ethics. *Philosophical Sciences*, pp.103–106.
4. Mishatkina, T. V. (2012). Conceptual foundations of environmental ethics. *Environmental ethics: studies. manual*. (pp.51-65). Minsk: Moscow State University of Economics A.D. Sakharova.
5. Moiseev, N. N. (1991). *Man, environment, society*. Moscow: Science.
6. Vernadsky, V. I. (1988). *The Philosophical Thoughts of a Naturalist*". (p.56). Moscow: Academy of Sciences of the USSR.
7. Mishatkina, T. V., & Melnov, S. B. (2016). Environmental ethics: life practice and theoretical principles in the context of ecobiopolitics. *Bioeconomy and ecobiopolitics, №1*, pp.182-189. <https://moluch.ru/th/7/archive/26/1186/>
8. (2015). *Global Bioethics in the Social Dimension: A Vocabulary Reference Book* / ed. T. V. Mishatkina (Eds.). (p.196). Minsk, IPEI them. A.D. Sakharov BSU.
9. Potter, V. R. (2002). *Bioethics: a bridge to the future*. (p.216). Kiev: Sphere.
10. Tulchinsky, G. L. (2002). *The modern humanitarian paradigm: humanitarianism against humanism?* Philosophical age. Almanac. Issue 21. The science of man in the modern world. Part 1. St. Petersburg, p.211.