

Competition and integration in the search for a new paradigm for maintaining biodiversity and ecosystem stability

Alexander S. Rasin^{1*}, Alexander A. Mosolov¹, and Ylyana A. Razina²

¹Volga Region Research Institute of Manufacture and Processing of Meat-and-Milk Production, Volgograd, Russian Federation

²CPM School, Moscow, Russian Federation

Abstract. Modern researchers in the humanities and natural sciences hold different and sometimes opposite views on the status of natural objects. The anthropocentric point of view prevails, considering man as the center of the universe and the goal of nature, which originates in the traditions of the Renaissance and the Christian Middle Ages about the transcendence of man and domination over nature. In modern versions of anthropocentrism, human needs and interests have an independent value, and people are regarded as exceptional beings with reason and morality. However, anthropocentrism is negatively perceived in many environmental and ethical discussions, as it has led to an ecological crisis, attributing instrumental value to nature. The biocentric approach, which gives moral status to all living beings, is becoming increasingly common in environmental ethics, and it is based on the principle of "reverence for life". With this approach, nature becomes a goal, not just a means, and all living organisms are considered the highest value. The ecocentric approach recognizes the moral status of ecosystems as a whole, denying the privileged status of people and emphasizing the responsibility of people for a responsible and careful attitude to the world around them.

1 Introduction

The growth of production is closely related to the quantitative growth of the exploitation of natural resources and the "predatory" attitude to nature, since it further increases the burden on the already depleted natural environment. There are limits to the possible loads on the ecosystem, which is losing stability due to the constantly increasing pressure on it. In order to avoid the final destruction of the natural habitat of man, to protect human health, a cardinal turn in economic policy and economic activity is necessary, all negative side effects associated with the intensive development of industry and the chemicalization of agricultural production should be fully analyzed and minimized [1].

The desire to increase the volume and growth of the social product – a universally recognized goal of the economy, in modern conditions can be justified if the exploitation of

* Corresponding author: razin-1978@yandex.ru

natural resources does not increase and the condition of responsible and careful handling of "natural capital" is fulfilled [2].

Quantitative economic development aimed at increasing the gross social product should be replaced by qualitative development aimed at improving living standards. This will be possible if the current consumption of natural resources is reduced or at least maintained. If natural factors are not considered as integral elements of the production process, then a violation of the ecological balance is inevitable.

A person uses natural resources to satisfy his material and cultural needs, but the limits of personal needs in the ecological aspect are limited by the objective capabilities of the ecological system. When organizing production, it is necessary to focus not only on the level of human needs, but also on the limits of permissible loads on the ecosystem as the basis of the existence of all living beings.

It becomes urgent and urgent to change the goals of economic policy, one of which must be environmental stability. This goal is most consistent with environmentally oriented management, which is not limited to reducing the production process mainly to improving well-being and equalizing the distribution of living conditions, but also assumes a careful attitude to the environment and the conservation of natural resources.

The fundamental goal of the economy is to satisfy human needs for vital goods, food, goods and services, which implies the active use of natural goods in the name of human and social development.

Efficiency can be considered as a necessary condition for a rationally organized management when the ecological aspect of the economy is given no less importance than the fundamental one.

2 Materials and methods

The study used a systematic methodology, which, in theoretical and practical terms, provides the most in-depth and objective analysis of reality, including problems related to maintaining biological diversity and ecosystem stability. Such work will significantly increase the boundaries of knowledge and expand the space of scientific search.

3 Results and discussion

Economic activity involves the exploitation of natural resources, including the conversion of natural resources and energy into consumer goods, and then in the production process – into waste. The most important reason for destabilization in the natural environment is the underestimation of the natural factor in the economic process. The process of producing material goods is accompanied by the depletion of irreplaceable natural resources and pollution of the environment with waste so much that the threat of the death of all mankind becomes real. Along with the increase in man's power over nature and the scale of his economic activity, the scale of the negative consequences of this activity for the ecological system is also growing.

Among the many reasons for the "predatory" attitude of society to nature, there are "unfair" forms of ownership in relation to the environment, mainly ownership of land and natural resources, which focuses on the growth of exploitation of natural resources and does not interest owners in their preservation. One of the conditions of the economic order that meets these requirements, according to many modern scientists (Arthur Rich, Hans Christoph Binswanger, Udo Ernst Simonis, etc.) may be the so-called conditional form of ownership, which does not provide for the sale of land and limits the power of owners on land and its wealth. Such property should be subject to the tasks of environmental protection and should

provide for the allocation of a certain share from public revenues for the exploitation of natural resources, as well as material responsibility for causing material damage to the ecological system [3].

An environmentally oriented economy, thanks to the introduction of expenses for the compensation of environmental losses and the implementation of environmental protection measures in the general economic balance, considers its task to create an order that recognizes the fundamental importance of the natural factor in the production process and prevents the destruction of natural resources.

Swiss scientist-economist A. Rich, following the German ecologist-economist H.K. Binswanger, believes that an environmentally regulated market economy based on property reform and the prohibition of free use of natural resources will eventually lead to high-quality economic growth and the creation of environmentally sound management [4].

The transition from quantitative to qualitative economic growth, which means reducing the expenditure of natural resources through innovation and technology improvement, is the most important environmental task of the economy. Modern technologies and equipment are powerful means of economic activity that give a person power over nature, which can lead to sad consequences – turning them into a means of domination over nature, an instrument of its destruction and destruction.

The environmental purpose of the economy corresponds to the nature conservation of technical means and technologies, their use in the interests of the protection and protection of ecosystems. The definition of the purpose of the economy is determined by the peculiarities of human existence in the world and is most fully expressed by A. Rich – "the service of life on earth" [5].

Economic goals are determined both by the requirements of the economic activity itself – ensuring the necessary means of human existence, well-being, satisfaction of his urgent material needs, and social goals – equalization of the distribution of living conditions; ecological – careful, responsible attitude to the natural environment in the process of production; spiritual - satisfaction of his spiritual needs, striving for self-realization and self-improvement.

The motives of economic management are not only economic goals proper, but also non-economic, spiritual, related to the moral and ethical tasks of transformation, spiritualization of the natural and social environment by economic means. As many modern economists emphasize, economic activity is not free from morality, ethics must necessarily be present in a market economy [6]. Awareness of the danger to humanity of negative side effects of economic activities having an ecological and socio-cultural nature, moral responsibility for them, led to the emergence of economic ethics.

Most environmental problems, both in industrial production and in the agricultural sector, although they have a technological nature, they cannot be solved only with the help of scientific and technical means, because they are of a social nature. Successful overcoming of these problems is possible if a new type of worldview and value system is adopted, from which people would recognize their moral obligations towards the natural environment.

The surrounding nature becomes an independent object of morality as a result of the increased influence of scientific and technological progress. The idea of moral significance, the value of all phenomena of the surrounding world has become the defining position of the so-called "deep ecology" and environmental ethics [7,8]. This problem has a debatable, open nature and is characterized by the presence of a large number of diverse opinions and approaches.

Classical economics understood nature mainly only as raw materials, to which economic value is given by the labor spent on its processing. Modern economic ethics recognizes the value qualities inherent in nature itself, the self-worth of nature as such. The semantic content of an environmentally oriented economy is determined by ethical norms based on moral and

cultural values, such as: "good", "freedom", "responsibility", "humanity", "solidarity", "justice", "duty", etc.

According to P. Kozlovsky, the demand for justice in relation to nature presupposes the recognition of the rights not only of man, but also of nature, regardless of the degree of its use by society, the rights of which a person as a representative of the "interests" of nature must defend against himself and his desire for expansion. The "rights" of nature in the process of making economic decisions should be compared with the rights of people to use nature [9].

In modern philosophical and ethical literature, one can find various, often diametrically opposed positions on the question of the value status of natural objects [10]. The popular point of view is that man is the center of the universe and its goal, since he is ontologically different from all other species of the animal world and occupies a special, dominant position in nature. This understanding of the relationship between man and nature is based on an anthropocentric worldview rooted in the philosophical traditions of the Renaissance, although the Christian Middle Ages with its principle of human transcendence in relation to nature and legitimate domination over it laid the foundation for such a worldview [11].

In modern versions of anthropocentrism, a person's attitude to nature is viewed through the prism of his needs and interests, which have an independent value, as only a person is an exceptional being with reason and morality. Man is regarded as the creator of the noosphere, rebuilding the world on a reasonable basis, leaving a worthy place for all living things, and in this sense he is the center of the universe.

In the modern domestic interpretation of economic theory - noonomics, which, according to S.D. Bodrunov, is also a new stage of social development, in which a person is excluded from material production and becomes a free creator. Man does not formally rule over nature, but does not cease to be the main goal of this stage of development [12].

In many modern ethical and environmental discussions, anthropocentrism appears as a negative form of worldview, because it is in it that they see the basis of consumer attitude to nature, which ultimately led to the modern ecological crisis.

The founder of "deep ecology", Norwegian ecologist A. Ness, considered anthropocentrism to be one of the main causes of the ecological crisis, which, in his opinion, attributes only instrumental value to nature [13]. The main disadvantage of anthropocentrism, its ethical limitations, many thinkers consider the narrowing of moral competence: the main criterion for evaluating human actions in relation to nature is only the good of the person himself. The results of intervention in nature are of interest only to the extent that they have an impact on humans, the state of the entire ecosystem with this approach fades into the background.

Modern environmental ethics is characterized by the expansion of the list of objects that are endowed with moral status.

The philosophical and ethical concept that gives moral status to all living beings is biocentrism, which is based on the principle of "reverence for life", developed by A. Schweitzer. [14]. This theory was most fully developed by the American ecophilosopher Paul Taylor, who considered the subject of environmental ethics to be the moral relations between man and the natural environment, which determine the responsibility of man as a rational being before nature [15]. A new value attitude is becoming such an understanding of the world in which nature becomes not just a means, but also as a person a goal.

The biocentric approach requires a respectful attitude to nature, considers all living organisms, whose existence is a good in itself and which therefore have an intrinsic value, to be of the highest value. The moral duty of a person with this approach is considered to respect the interests and protection of the rights of all living beings, whose interests are put above all. Within the framework of biocentrism, the so-called "left biocentrism" stands out, whose supporters declare that all living nature should be treated with the same moral principles as

people. In its extreme manifestations, this trend can lead to environmental terrorism - radical actions of social groups actively fighting for animal rights and not excluding the commission of even illegal actions.

Modern man must abandon the attitude that he is the "lord of nature", the "crown of creation", designed to conquer nature and fight with it.

The moral and ethical responsibility of a person to the natural world is to understand his role and place in the world around him, to treat nature as an "equal partner", and not as a "disenfranchised object", with which a person is connected by an attitude of interdependence.

From an ethical point of view, this means abandoning the traditionally anthropocentric understanding of a person's attitude to the world in favor of a different approach, which includes an ecological aspect. The approach that most clearly demonstrates the weakness and limitations of anthropocentrism is the ecocentric approach, which recognizes the moral status of ecosystems as a whole [16]. Ecocentrism is based on the recognition of the ontological connection between man and the surrounding nature, the intrinsic value of ecosystems, which determines their moral status. This approach denies the privileged status of a person, his exceptional self-worth in comparison with other representatives of the living world. Biocentrism is considered by many researchers as one of the trends of ecocentrism, which differs from it in that priority is given to living organisms, without focusing special attention on the problems of preserving inanimate nature. The terms "biocentrism" and "ecocentrism" are not strictly delimited in environmental ethics and are sometimes used as synonyms.

The origins of the ecocentric approach are contained in the works of the American ecologist O. Leopold, in which the author proposes to revise the established ideas about the boundaries of human moral responsibility. In his concept of "ethics of the Earth", he proposes to look at man as an integral part and an equal member of the wider community of nature [17]. The fact that a person stands out among other biological species by his intelligence and other distinctive abilities leads to the emergence of a duty to treat the world around him responsibly and carefully. Supporters of ecocentrism perceive nature as a subject of action that has its own goals and interests and has moral rights. Norwegian philosopher A. Nessom develops the concept of "deep ecology" in which the key place is occupied by the idea of the intrinsic value of ecosystems. In "deep ecology", the main value is considered to be nature, its prosperity and well-being, and the usefulness of the ecosphere for humanity is secondary [18].

4 Conclusion

Thus, we can say that the modern concepts of biocentrism and ecocentrism successfully compete with the concept of anthropocentrism. Each of these theories absolutizes one of the sides in the "man –nature" system. The opposition of anthropocentrism and other approaches can lead to the emergence of a real threat of "distortion" in the perception of nature and environmental management of modern society, which, in turn, can accelerate the destruction of the environment. We need a new, integrative approach to solving this most important problem of our time, a new paradigm, without which the survival of the planet, its ecological sphere in all its diversity is impossible. The so-called non-anthropocentrism is considered as one of such paradigms, the value principle. This new paradigm expands the subject of moral responsibility and extends it to all living things, not just to humanity. All ecosystems are valuable by themselves without reference to human needs. [19]. It should be noted that non-anthropocentrism in its logical apotheosis requires humanity to do the impossible, namely to act contrary to its interests, which in fact is a "suicide strategy" [20].

The balance of man with nature in this approach is achieved by changing the consciousness, way of thinking, behavior and way of human economic activity. In the modern world, a new environmental strategy should be developed on the basis of a responsible

attitude to the ecosystem and recognition of our responsibilities towards the environment [21]. Such a strategy gives a person the duties of a protector and guardian and therefore imposes on him a huge responsibility for the consequences of his activities. Limiting the loads of industrial and agricultural production on the natural environment should become a new fundamental ecological principle.

References

1. M. I. Slozhenkina, I. F. Gorlov, Some environmental problems in food production, *Food industry* **4(34)**, 24-26 (2017)
2. R. Costanza, H. E. Daly, *Conservation Biology* **6(1)**, 37-46 (1992)
3. A. S. Razin, B. A. Navrotskii, O. V. Dushko, A. A. Churakov, *Normative Regulation of Economic Activity*, International scientific congress «knowledge, man and civilization», European Publisher, 22-25 October 2020, Grozny, Russia (2021)
4. A. Rich, *Economic ethics* (Posev, M., 1996)
5. A. Rich, *Economic existence in the industrial world* (Geneva, 1964)
6. S. Beugelsdijk, R. Maseland, *Culture in economics: History, methodological reflections, and contemporary applications* (Cambridge, 2011)
7. P. Ehrlich, Collapse of civilisation is a near certainty within decades www.theguardian.com/cities/2018/mar/22/collapse-civilisation-near-certain-decades-population-bomb-paul-ehrllich. (Gardian, 2018)
8. M. A. Schroll, D. Rothenberg, *Map Bulletin* **19(1)**, 41-43 (2009)
9. P. Kozlowski, *Principles of Ethical Economy* (Economic School, St. Petersburg, 1999)
10. O. O'Neil, *The Hastings Center Report* **31(4)**, 15-23 (2001)
11. R. Atfield, *Ethics of Environmental Responsibility* (Progress, M., 1990)
12. S. D. Bodrunov, *Bulletin of the Institute of Economics of the Russian Academy of Sciences* **1**, 7-31 (2022)
13. A. Ness, *Surface and deep long-term ecological movement* (Moscow, 1973)
14. A. Schweitzer, *Culture and Ethics* (Progress, M., 1973)
15. P. Taylor, *Biocentric egalitarianism, Environmental ethics* (L. Pojman, Jones and Bartlett Publishers, Boston-London, 1994)
16. V. V. Dezhkin, *Humanitarian Ecological Journal* **4**, 44-46 (2002)
17. O. Leopold, *The Calendar of the sandy county* (Mir, M., 1983)
18. V. N. Semenova, *Scientific works of the Republican Institute of Higher Education. Historical and psychological and pedagogical sciences* **18**, 248-257 (2019)
19. R.G. Apresyan, *Ethical Thought* **10**, 5-20 (2010)
20. N. D. Popovich, *Perspectives of Science and Education* **1(7)**, 14-18 (2014)
21. A. A. Milyakova, *Central Russian Bulletin of Social Sciences* **4**, 148-152 (2008)