

From ecosophy to deep ecology: for a new ecological and sustainable paradigm

Da ecosofia à ecologia profunda: por um novo paradigma ecológico e sustentável

Elisaide Trevisam(1); Julio Trevisam Braga(2); Isaque Trevisam Braga(3)

1 Doutora em Filosofia do Direito pela Pontifícia Universidade Católica de São Paulo (PUC-SP). Mestre em Direitos Humanos. Especialista em Direito do Trabalho e Processo do Trabalho. Professora no Programa de Mestrado em Direito da Universidade Federal de Mato Grosso do Sul (UFMS).

E-mail: elisaidetrevisam@gmail.com | ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6909-7889>

2 Doutorando (bolsista CNPq) e Mestre (bolsista CNPq) em História Social pela Pontifícia Universidade Católica de São Paulo (PUC-SP). Professor na Faculdade da Aliança Educacional do Estado de São Paulo (FAEESP).

E-mail: julio.t.braga@gmail.com | ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9738-3145>

3 Mestre em Filosofia pela Pontifícia Universidade Católica de São Paulo (PUC-SP). Especialista em Filosofia Clínica pelo Instituto Interseção de São Paulo, com ênfase em Terapia Ecosófica. Bacharel e Licenciado em Filosofia pela Pontifícia Universidade Católica de São Paulo (PUC-SP). Professor de Filosofia na Fundação de Rotarianos de São Paulo.

E-mail: isaque.t.braga@gmail.com | ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6596-7245>

Revista Brasileira de Direito, Passo Fundo, vol. 16, n. 1, p. 1-19, Janeiro-Abril, 2020 - ISSN 2238-0604

[Received/Recebido: Setembro 21, 2020; Accepted/Aceito: Novembro 08, 2020;

Publicado/Published: Fevereiro 05, 2021]

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18256/2238-0604.2020.v16i1.4307>

Como citar este artigo / How to cite item: [clique aqui! / click here!](#)

Abstract

Currently, the issue surrounding sustainable development still faces strong resistance to effectuate a responsible acquaintanceship of human beings with the environment in which they live. In this sense, it is necessary to develop an ethical, epistemological and even political posture capable of developing a new sustainable paradigm. Thus, this article proposes to establish, as its objective, the dialogue between the concepts of *ecosophy* (Naess and Guattari) and *deep ecology* (Naess), in order to promote a human acquaintanceship with nature, evolving the ecological foundation of environmental sustainability. In order to carry out this investigation, the present research will take place through a scientific analysis of bibliographic nature, dialoguing concepts through a deductive approach method, searching to develop the evolution of the debate about the new ecological paradigm of sustainability. As a result, the composition of the objectives and methodology listed allows a glimpse of a new sustainable paradigm capable of bringing together the human collectivity and nature as equally members of the same natural community and, therefore, in an interdependent relationship.

Keywords: Ecosophy. Deep Ecology. Ecological Paradigm. Sustainability. Natural Community.

Resumo

Atualmente, a problemática em torno do desenvolvimento sustentável encontra ainda forte resistência para tornar efetiva uma convivência responsável do ser humano com o meio ambiente em que vive. Nesse sentido, se faz necessário desenvolver uma postura ética, epistemológica e mesmo política capaz de desenvolver um novo *paradigma sustentável*. Desse modo, este artigo propõe estabelecer, como objetivo, o diálogo entre os conceitos de *ecosofia* (Naess e Guattari) e de *ecologia profunda* (Naess), a fim de promover a (con)vivência humana com a natureza, fazendo evoluir o fundamento ecológico de sustentabilidade ambiental. Para levar a cabo esta investigação, a presente pesquisa se dará por meio de uma análise científica de cunho bibliográfico, dialogando conceitos através de um método de abordagem dedutivo, na busca por se desenvolver a evolução do debate sobre o novo paradigma ecológico da sustentabilidade. Como resultado, a composição dos objetivos e da metodologia elencados permite entrever um novo paradigma sustentável capaz de reunir a coletividade humana e natureza como igualmente integrantes de uma mesma comunidade natural e, portanto, numa relação interdependente.

Palavras-chave: Ecosofia. Ecologia Profunda. Paradigma Ecológico. Sustentabilidade. Comunidade Natural.

1 Introduction

Based on the philosophical, historical and social facts of the construction of a new human conscience, the objective is to present a challenge to reflect on the ecological crisis that is being experienced by contemporary society and the need for a new attitude of man before the whole, centered, in turn, on the power of using rational, moral and ethical knowledge at the service of the realization of humanity, for the effectuation of a balanced environment and sustainable development.

The problem surrounding sustainable development has not yet found a tangible conclusion for the realization of a responsible and solidary acquaintanceship between human beings and the environment within which they exist as a species.

However, the emergence of the *ecosophical* theory (NAESS, 1994; GUATTARI, 2012) opens a new front to face this problem, putting in evidence that the philosophical, ethical, political and social reflections of contemporary reality cannot be abandoned in order to reach the ends proposed here.

On the other hand, overcoming a limited conception around environmental sustainability becomes an ethical and epistemological duty, aiming to possibilitate to put into practice the implementation of a new sustainable paradigm.

Thus, the evolution of philosophical thinking around the concept of *deep ecology* (NAESS, 1998) allowed the maturation of the proposed discussion, recognizing the need and the importance of defending the environment beyond its natural aspect, once that we are dealing with a context in which human beings are inserted, with their subjectivities and social relations understood there but, above all, the nature that is also vitally connected to humanity, in an ecological interdependence, that is, in a web of life (CAPRA, 2006).

Finally, in order to achieve the proposed objectives, this research will take place through a scientific analysis of bibliographic nature, dialoguing concepts through a deductive approach method, in the search to develop the evolution of the debate about the new ecological paradigm of sustainability.

2 Ecosophy from the perspective of Félix Guattari

Ecosophy is a field of investigation that shows itself as a growing subcurrent of Philosophy. Of the various ecosophical currents, it's possible to speak about of three main approaches at least, namely the ethical, ontological and social approaches, noting that in reality, these approaches are not located in a pure form so that would be fully covered under the various developments in which it presents itself to Philosophy.

The ecosophical studies tend to consider mankind predominantly as beings that express value judgments, arguing that the main causes of human actions are

consolidated values and norms. In this sense, if human actions must correspond to a human permanence as a species, the deterioration of the environment presents itself as an effect of incoherent values.

Whitin this perspective, if mankind can be seen as conscious and rational beings, whose actions are determined by their views of the world, the fundamental cause of the ecological crisis would be a flawed interpretation of the world that substantially derives from the process of acquiring knowledge. Such perspective ends up privileging the appreciation of epistemology above a true and proper ontology and, particularly, the importance of this observation refers to a critical position around the imperialism of scientific knowledge.

In this way, the attention returned to focus on more concrete issues, among which daily life and philosophy seem committed to renewing its old tradition of knowledge useful for the construction of life, personal identity, relationship with others and the world.

Enrique Leff explains that:

The environmental issue has emerged in the last decades as a crisis of civilization, [...] questioning the dominant economic and technological rationality. This crisis has been explained by a diversity of ideological perspectives, [...] and this environmental problem has generated global changes in complex socioenvironmental systems that affect the planet's sustainability conditions, proposing the need to internalize the ecological bases and [epistemological principles] that guide the construction of a productive rationality based on ecological sustainability and social equity (LEFF, 2010, p. 62).

The purpose of *ecosophy* is to achieve a total and complete vision of the human condition, both in a collective and individual way and this completeness comprises the entire global context, whose human being is inserted, dividing a world of diverse cultures that move towards a total vision, always looking for answers for living together in harmony with the Earth. Not forgetting that what each individual and what each community does and will always do is to inhabit, a place, in a place, always with others according to certain moral habits.

From an ecological perspective centered on the concept of living, the ecological crisis appears as a break in the original relationships between culture and nature, between society and place, between living and habits.

If the roots of the crisis are cultural and its effects are also felt in the language and in the way of being in the world, in the way of inhabiting and hosting in a territory, it is precisely from there that the need will arise to reconstruct a close relationship with

the environment, and as a consequence, highlight strategies for solving the same global ecological crisis.

Therefore, ecosophy considers as its object not only the dimension of the environment as a principle of nature, but in the same condition and quality of social relations with its subjectivities, which operate inside and outside the individuals that compose it, rescuing life in its fuller meaning through interdependent and articulated ecosophical dimensions, built on the basis of the individual's relations with themselves and with all beings, as a species and as groups intrinsically linked to the natural environment in which they belong.

The panorama outlined by the ecosophy has the bias of understanding the moral value of nature and the principle on which founds a duty to respect it, starting from a reflection on the ecological crisis experienced in the present days. For Felix Guattari, within a perspective more focused on the social and political sphere as the environmental crisis matrix, the basis of the environmental problem is founded in integrated worldwide capitalism, starting from the reflection on the global tendency to move from simple production mode to a occupation of a more immaterial sphere of communication through the formation of the subject and its articulations in social relations (GUATTARI, 2012, p. 7).

The mankind has the ability to relate to a much broader sense of being, which transcends the ego, extending the sense of identification beyond the point focused on the ego and walking back into a broader sphere of interrelations, being not so difficult to identify themselves with the other living beings of nature. Thus,

The Earth planet is going through a period of intense technical-scientific transformations, in contrast to with ecological imbalance phenomena that, if not remedied, on limit, threaten life on its surface. In parallel to such disturbances, individual and collective human ways of life evolve towards a progressive deterioration (GUATTARI, 2012, p. 7).

It can be said that human ways of life, both individually and collectively, are compromised in the face of the devastating breakdown and the evils that are installed around nature and there will be no real response to the ecological crisis unless on a planetary scale, with the proviso of operating an authentic political, social and cultural revolution that reconduct the objectives of the production of material or immaterial goods. This revolution should concern not only the relations of forces visible on a large scale, but also the domains of sensitivity, intelligence and desires (GUATTARI, 2012, p. 9).

In this sense, it's possible to approach Guattari to the indications and thoughts of Hannah Arendt (2010) about the human condition, not as a human essence or nature, but as a definition of mankind under the political and rational animal aspect, that is,

a conditioned, finite and precarious subject, capable to become somebody through his inaction and passivity, or to do himself in the political action bringing something new to the world. It can be stated that:

[...], wherever we turn, we find this same nagging paradox: on the one hand, the continuous development of new technical-scientific means potentially capable of solving the dominant ecological problems and determining the rebalancing of socially useful activities on the planet's surface and, on the other hand, the inability of organized social forces and subjective formations constituted to appropriate these means to make them operational (GUATTARI, 2012, p. 12).

Then, with Ecosophy, Guattari presents the creation of a new reference that makes it possible to indicate lines that will recompose human praxis in its most varied domains and, in this context, the discourses on the defense of the environment must be overcome by new ways of conceiving the production of human existence that will bring new perspectives in the history of the world.

2.1 The three ecologies

To define ecosophy, Félix Guattari proposes to extend the institutions of environmental ecology to the field of the individual and social psyche through his thinking about “the three ecologies”.

2.1.1 The ecology of mind

The ecology of mind will make use of a pre-objective and pre-personal logic that does not materialize the subject, but that starts from an indistinction of mental objects and be able to follow the bifurcated ruptures that produce subjectivity. It is an ecology that concerns the relationship of each human being developed with his body and with his subjectivities, with the mysteries of life and death, or even with spirituality, that is, a personal ecology that translates itself into connections of mankind with the world resisting the homogeneous tendencies of political and ideological manipulations.

The practices that the ecology of mind will put into action will resignify the enunciation concatenations that, in any case, will articulate with the rest of society. So the ecology of mind operates based on the principle of recognition of the limitation and fragility of the human condition, proposing the rescue of respecting to one's own body with its immanent characteristics, acting by the logic of accepting oneself and referring mankind to his animality, or that is, what each human being is simply in his nature.

This ecosophical attitude of mankind calls for a deep recognition and acceptance of the most intimate human being spheres, being revealed the self and the acceptance of its specificities of human subjectivity, in other words, it is about peace with oneself, tolerance, welcome and care for your own life.

2.1.2 *The social ecology*

Social ecology will promote the affective and pragmatic investment in human groups in their various dimensions, corresponding to a qualitatively specific reconversion of the primary subjectivity of the subject what descends from mental ecology. Social ecology will also deal with the proliferation of new valuation systems that have suffered a fall from the state and from capitalist economic power, which could join with the development of social issues. As Guattari explains,

The social ecosophy will therefore consist of developing specific practices that tend to modify and reinvent ways of being within the couple, family, urban context, work etc. [...] The issue will be to reconstruct the set of modalities of being-in-group literally. And not only for “communicational” interventions, but also for existential mutations that concern the essence of subjectivity. In this domain, we would not stick to general recommendations, but we would operate effective experimentation practices at both the micro-social levels and at larger institutional scales (GUATTARI, 2012, p. 15-16).

The values promoted by the ecosophical practices would, evidently, be very far from the characteristics of the general equivalent, typical of the capitalist valuation system, based on the financial market. Collective interests would be much more considered in terms of art, research and individual initiatives.

Based on the assertion that the work for the reconstruction of human relations (GUATTARI, 2012, p. 33) is the axis of social ecosophy at all levels of *socius*, it cannot be forgotten that “the capitalist power shifted in extension about infiltrating the most unconscious subjective strata”.

In this way, the social dimension must be understood based on the assumption of the expansion of collective interests, which will depend on the capacity for openness to dialogue and the exploration of possibilities of relationship and experience with the other, within a link between collective desires and subjectivities. Only then will be possible to re-establishing the union between nature and society, and the mankind will become free to build multiple connections of reconciliation with themselves, with others and with the environment.

2.1.3 *The environmental ecology*

As for environmental ecology, Guattari affirms the particular principle that everything is possible, from “the worst catastrophes to the evolutions that flow with ease”. More and more natural balances fall on human intervention, and these interventions will depend on mankind’s relationships with themselves, regarding his subjectivity, and with the environment.

In environmental ecology, it is not only about the defense of nature, but the fight for a better life quality, sustainability, rights and an environmental democracy in terms of the reappropriation of nature based on social and individual references. As Guattari explains,

[...] the environmental ecology, as it exists today, did nothing but initiate and prefigure the generalized ecology that I advocate here and which will aim to radically decentralize social struggles and ways of assuming the psyche itself. The current ecological movements certainly have many merits, but I think that, in fact, the global ecosophical issue is too important to be left to some archaic and folkloric currents, that sometimes deliberately choose to refuse any and all large-scale political engagement. The connotation of ecology should no longer be linked to the image of a small minority of nature lovers or qualified specialists (GUATTARI, 2012, p. 36).

It should be noted that the environmental ecosophy was outlined by Guattari based on the ecosophy of mind together with the social ecosophy, in order to accentuate the interposition of the three ecologies articulated in their dimensions, to reinforce the thought that life will only be reinvented since that, the three ecological visions are intertwined. Therefore, the common principle of Félix Guattari’s three ecologies consists in the fact that the existential territory, with which they are confronted,

[...] do not occur as a own closed “in-itself”, but as a precarious, finite, singular and singularized “for-itself”, capable of bifurcating or in stratified and deadly reiterations or in a procedural opening from practice that allows it to be made habitable by a human project. Is this practical opening that constitutes the essence of the “eco” art that submits all the ways to domesticate the existential territories, whether related to the intimate ways of being, of the body, of the environment or of the great contextual groups related to ethnicity, to the nation or to the general rights of humanity (GUATTARI, 2012, p. 37-38).

With the reflection on ecosophy it concludes that the definition of Environment as a space, or territory, as a provider of infinite resources from where it is possible to extract from nature, in a continuous and unlimited process, something that exclusively supports the economic growth and continue towards the continuous transformations closely linked by the idea of “progress”, refers to the finding that, especially, the absence of measures that balance the relationship between production and consumption within technical-scientific societies brings to the fore the danger of an impending catastrophe, more and more inserted in a concrete reality where the future possibility of human life finds serious difficulties.

Therefore, in order to deepen the *ecosophical* definition of human experience in its environment, its articulation with the concept of deep ecology will compose the affirmation of a new paradigm, proposed in order to reconfigure human acquaintanceship with nature, in an interdependent relationship and that allows the effectivation of a sustainable environment.

3 Historical-philosophical perspective of nature

The Western philosophical tradition has always faced the question of nature, and it can be said that Greek philosophy was born around this problem, that is, the search for *arché* (the foundation of all things) and *physis* (nature) from the thoughts of Tales of Miletus (c. 624-546 BC), nature occupied a prominent place within the scope of the thinking of western thinkers.

However, this reflection has changed over the course of history and this is not only valid for the conclusions reached by philosophers over time, due to the harmony of the cosmos, the ancients, or the machinist view, of the modern ones. What happened, in fact, was not a change only in the answers, but a change that also occurred in the nature of the questions about nature, posed by philosophy.

At first, ancient philosophical thought turned to physics as the main source for obtaining answers around the investigation of what unites nature, since its particular expressions are so varied.

This theoretical interest, mainly focused on the study of principles, the description of nature, the understanding of its internal secrets, has a continuity that plays a crucial role in the history of philosophy through the Aristotelian categories of analysis, medieval universals, Cartesian *res extensa*, philosophy of romantic nature and contemporary theoretical physics.

The critical reflection on nature in its essence, after Socratic thoughts, was configured as an ethical issue, where the ethical question regarding nature was placed on the relationship between this and the essence of human action.

There were very diverse interpretations of such a relationship, and nature was seen as a source of natural law and of principles and references to the act of acting morally well, being possible to quote the thoughts of Aristotle, the Stoics, Locke, Rousseau, among others, or, still, of sin and corruption according to Catholic theology.

The discussion of the problem was based on the idea that nature inspired good actions in mankind, as a natural cause, prescribed by the law of nature or not. The important thing is that, despite the questioning, the object of moral attention was almost always made up of mankind and not of other natural entities.

It will be from the nineteenth century that space will be opened for a new way of approaching nature, when it will no longer be considered only as a form of human actions, that is, natural actions or against nature, but begins to assume value as the recipient of moral concern.

Modern man, away from nature and seeking refuge in the fortress of the spirit, has rediscovered himself as an inhabitant of the same nature at the moment when his economic interests threaten his home, that is, his environment.

Nature, therefore, came to be recognized not only as a “pedagogical” value, as a former of the spirit, but also as a value of its own, dignified of being protected from the threat of the economic-industrial complex.

The ethical springs of the environment could follow two main paths: the first consisted of an extension to other subjects with inviolable rights, or, still, the moral consideration of their own interests that were considered the prerogative of humans and the second could be related to a radical change of paradigm, putting into question the same notion of right and individual pleasure/suffering to focus on empathy, expansion of the concept of self, considerations of direct and indirect interrelationships between individuals, collectivities and economic, cultural, mental structures.

The tyranny that human animals exert over non-human animals has caused and continues to cause a great deal of suffering today compared to that produced by centuries of indisputable dominance by white-skinned humans over black-skinned humans. The fight against this tyranny was of equal importance to all other moral or social battles fought in recent years.

In a legal perspective, Francesco Viola notes that, from the moment that nature is given a legal status, historically, nature assumes the only role of environment necessary for human survival. which means that the environment of human experience is subject to legal protection, in a sine qua non condition, only if it is linked to the cultural notion of nature, “linked to man and the quality of human life” (VIOLA, 1994, p. 157-158).

Quoting Massimo Severo Giannini, Viola states that:

Oggi si ritiene eticamente riprovevole aggredire l'ambiente se ein quanto lo si renda aggressivo; se l'azione umana non producesse questo evento dannoso per la collettività, l'aggressione

dell'ambiente potrebbe provocare rimpianti, o altri fatti emozionali, ma non interesserebbe la normazione giuridica. L'ambiente aggressore è invece preoccupante, talora per le sue dimensioni superstatali (GIANNINI, 1976, p. 3 *apud* VIOLA, 1994, p. 157-158).

This is what happens in the present content of Brazilian legal system, for example, which defines the environment as a public good and whose purpose it is to preserve the human and common well-being of the Brazilian people.

In this sense, Heron J. de S. Gordilho reinforces that nature, considered an environmental good, ended up being subject "to limitations that assure everyone the mediated enjoyment of good, with regard, for example, to its scenic beauty, oxygen production, wild animal refuge, etc." (GORDILHO, 2016, p. 130).

In order to be able to resize nature in the field of legal science, it is necessary to consider the environment in the list of diffuse rights, overcoming the limitations of aspects of public or private law and, therefore, the environment becomes a "unsusceptible division" object (GORDILHO, 2016, p. 130).

Peter Singer, using emotionally participating descriptions, moves explicitly over the ground of moral reasoning, separating the affection, piety or sensitivity that can be had for an animal, from the ethical need to put an end to the oppression and exploitation everywhere it manifests, to ensure the fundamental moral principle of equal consideration of interests so that it does not arbitrarily come to circumscribe our species (SINGER, 2010, p. 9-10).

The sacredness of the individual with interests that are equivalent to all other individuals, often with their unquestionable meaning in modern reality, involves the sacralization of some economic freedoms to the detriment of others.

This choice resulted in the loss of the political dimension of the horizon of human actions, making the social power to determine the legality and preference of interests less and less decisive, thus resulting in a weakening of the capacity to project the common good or to foresee the individuals will as a prerogative of society and not of the individual.

In this sphere of thought, it is important to conclude that the concept of ecosystem is, in environmental philosophy and in the ecological political movement, with meta-scientific, ethical and aesthetic meanings in order to bring harmony, balance and autonomy to nature.

In modern times, several thoughts brought to the nature a less focused view on the function and its use value. In this regard, Baruch Espinosa saw nature as an infinite substance and, therefore, as God, that is, the parts of nature as a modification of a single whole (ESPINOSA, 2005, p. 112).

Espinosa founds his ethics on a deterministic vision founded on the absolute necessity that derives from the infinitely potent nature of God himself, that is, in nature

there is nothing contingent, but all things are determined by the divine nature's need to be and to operate. He also criticizes the prejudice that mankind "have been considering all natural things as means for their useful life", not so much in the sense of the improper exploitation of nature, but as in the sense of a projection in nature aimed at satisfying human needs (ESPINOSA, 2005, p. 122).

For Espinosa, those who believe that man disturbs the order of nature are wrong, instead of following it, since nature has no "addictions" or exceptions, but follows the same rules everywhere, and explains that:

Therefore, it can be concluded, absolutely, that in all that, of which there may be several individuals, there must necessarily be an external cause for which these individuals exist. Therefore, since the nature of the substance belongs to exist, its definition must involve its necessary existence, and, consequently, it is only from its definition that the respective existence must be concluded (ESPINOSA, 1973, p. 91).

An integrated view of nature emerges from Spinoza's writings in which all the particular elements are mutable expressions of an infinite substance that is God Himself. By the conception of the intellectual love for nature, he handed over to later tradition an image of a less instrumental, more affective and captivating nature, more mental faculties than the only technical-scientific utilitarian rationality. "The intellectual love of the mind towards God is part of the infinite love with which God loves himself", in view of the perspective that God can be understood as the nature system (ESPINOSA, 2005, p. 369).

On the other hand, for Schelling, nature does not enjoy autonomous values regarding to human intelligence, since natural non-human beings are failed attempts by a nature that have, in any case, as the greatest expression of themselves the result of the intelligence of par excellence, that is, the natural product that testifies to the unity of the subjective and objective, of the spirit and of nature itself. Thus, Schelling is based on the ontological distinction between the subject and the object, considering them in the same process investigated by two opposite starting points, maintaining the idea of a primacy of values of what is conscious and intelligent, attributing these characteristics exclusively to the human species (SCHELLING, 2006, p. 55).

Putting aside the manipulative relationship of the economy that mystifies sustainable development, it is necessary to find a concept that serves as a reference for a desirable ecology or various ecologies, scientific, philosophical and political that knows how to put the harmful model of capitalist development in crisis, aiming to recreate a close and harmonious relationship between human and non-human nature.

4 A new paradigm from Deep Ecology

Drawing a more lucid outline of the ecological debate, the proposed reflection is to operate a distinction to expose the known meanings of ecology, that is, the meaning of Science, as the main part of biology that studies the living being in its interactions with the environment; the meaning of Philosophy, as an ethical and political reflection, which considers the relationship between the living being and nature, from the perspective of overcoming man's dominance over the rest of nature in a theoretical and aesthetic way and the legal meaning and actions affirmative statements regarding the effectiveness of equality and the emancipation of the subject of law, actions that reflect intrinsically in the social, economic and political sense. In this way, a reflection on Ecology as a political movement will be traced in a relationship of interdependence and not of commercialization with the environment.

When mankind exposes his expectations in relation to dominating nature, right after the Industrial Revolution, a kind of race against time begins to potentiate the destruction of the environment and the development of the economy. From then, "the way humanity is dealing with this scenario brings to light the fact that its future depends exclusively on how it is willing to treat the future of the environment in which it lives" (BRAGA, 2015, p. 8).

When it comes to sustainable development, it must not be forgotten that a society in which its members recognize the imperative task of taking care of each other and taking charge of managing common affairs, requires solidary and responsible citizens to face the challenges ahead presented within a complex society, centered on the concept of living and on the ecological crisis as a break in the original relationships between culture and nature, between society and place, between living and habits.

To the possibility of achieving this sustainable development within a complex society and, so that everyone opts for solidarity and ethical responsibility towards nature and all human beings, in addition to reflecting on a possible planetary acquaintanceship in an integralizing and emancipatory way, the Ecosophy becomes a means of understanding the moral value of nature and the principle on which the duty to respect it is founded, starting from a reflection on the ecological crisis experienced today, through an ethical, ontological and social approaches.

The various declinations of the view on the questions of ecology are not mere accidents and, concretely, in the semantic field and in history, there is a transmission of traditional thoughts, research and actions that do not share the same starting points or similar conclusions, but they only refer to a lecture of the ever more evanescent contours, that is, the relationship between mankind and nature to those of modernity and nature, the ethical relevance of man as a rational animal to that of ecosystems, landscapes, primitive cultures and, still, from the description of the natural world to the critique of contemporary industrialization.

Based on a new perception of reality, Capra proposes the restructuring of the scientific view at all levels of living systems, whether organisms, social systems or ecosystems, in order to undertake the expansion of this perception not only in science or philosophy, but, above all, in commercial activities, in politics, in health, in education and in daily life. Thus, Capra's proposal is to create a new basis for ecological policies that will allow the construction and support of communities that do not endanger the possibilities of future generations, seeking to alert to the need to establish a sustainable balance between the political spheres, economic, social and cultural (*apud* BRAGA, 2015).

Faced with the threat offered by the ethical irresponsibility of the technical-scientific progress, bringing to light a profound crisis in the moral paradigm, not only within the scope of the scientific sphere, but even that designated by the author as the "crisis of the social paradigm", Capra discloses the urgency of changing paradigms.

From the cultural transformation of the social paradigm crisis, Capra exposes the generalization of Thomas Kuhn's definition of scientific paradigm (KHUN, 1962) as "a constellation of achievements - concepts, values, techniques, etc. - shared by a scientific community", and used by it "to define legitimate problems and solutions", to then analyze the social paradigm shift, which Capra defines as "a constellation of conceptions, values, perceptions and practices shared by a community", and that "shapes a particular view of reality, which forms the basis of the way the community is organized" (CAPRA, 2006, p. 24-25).

The new paradigm proposed by him arises in order to break with the mechanistic view of the universe and institute a holistic world view, "which conceives the world as an integrated whole, and not as a collection of dissociated parts", thus being able to at the same time, to call it an ecological vision, where the "ecological" is used in a deep ecological perception that "recognizes the fundamental interdependence of all phenomena, and the fact that, as individuals and societies, we are all embedded in the cyclical processes of nature"(CAPRA, 2006, p. 25), since humanity becomes, in the end, dependent on these same processes.

However, before generalizations fall, Capra specifies the distinction he makes between a holistic worldview and a deep ecological perception, determining the importance of distinguishing the two visions when addressing living systems, as they maintain a "more vital connection" with the environment. Thus:

The two terms, "holistic" and "ecological", differ slightly in their meanings, and it appears that "holistic" is somewhat less appropriate to describe the new paradigm. A *holistic view*, saying, of a bicycle means seeing the bicycle as a functional whole and understanding, accordingly, the interdependencies of its parts. An *ecological view* of the bicycle includes this, but it adds to the perception of how the

bicycle is embedded in its natural and social environment - where the raw materials that enter it come from, how it was manufactured, how its use affects the environment natural and the community for which it is used, and so on (CAPRA, 2006, p. 14).

In this way, the new ecological paradigm that Capra proposes recognizes the intrinsic value of each living being, “conceives human beings only as a particular thread in the web of life” (CAPRA, 2006, p. 26-27).

At this moment, the author is linked to Arne Naess’s understanding of *deep ecology*, which is expressed by the distinction between a “shallow ecology” and a “deep ecology”, finding wide use to refer to the divisions within contemporary environmentalist thought.

On the one hand, shallow ecology is distinguished for being anthropocentric, that is, for being centered on the human being, since it considers it above or outside nature, “as the source of all values”, giving nature an instrumental value, if not “use”.

On the other hand, *deep ecology* perceives an interdependence between human beings and the natural environment, and the world is seen “not as a collection of isolated objects, but as a network of phenomena that are fundamentally interconnected and are interdependent” (CAPRA, 2006, p. 26-27).

Heron J. de S. Gordilho brings up the existing dichotomy between a Shallow Ecology and a Deep Ecology, arguing that, for its resolution, it is necessary to replace the concept of sustainable development with the notion “acceptable global survival”, an idea coined by Van Rensselaer Potter, author of *Global Bioethics: Converting Sustainable Development to Global Survival*:

For [Potter], the expression sustainable development - because it carries with it two core ideas, development and sustainability (the first, linked to the idea of growth, expansion of the number of successful enterprises, and the second, related to the need to ensure the existence of resources natural for a few more decades) - it is an anthropocentric concept aimed at safeguarding the economic interests of the present and future generations (GORDILHO, 2016, p. 11-12).

What Gordilho rescues with *deep ecology* is the need to overcome the concept of sustainability linked to the condition of corresponding, specifically, to the guarantee of future generations to enjoy the resources that nature has for human survival. What should be sought, therefore, “is the protection of nature itself” (GORDILHO, 2016, p. 12).

Defender of a holistic and biocentric vision, Arne Naess presents a deep ecological movement, refuting the image of humanity inserted in a different environment in favor of the image of a total and relational field, where organisms are like the nodes of a

network of relationships intrinsic, that is, the model where the total field dissolves the acceptable idea only at a superficial or preliminary level of communication, according to which mankind and objects can be conceived from the same environment, therefore, it is a biospheric egalitarianism (NAESS, 1994, p. 29-30).

Starting from the idea that there is an equal right for all to live and to fulfill their own ends, reducing this equal right to human beings only has negative effects on any type of life on the planet, according to Arne Naess (NAESS, 1998, p. 95), there are two categories of ecology, that is, deep ecology and shallow ecology. Shallow ecology is defined as the movement that fights against pollution and the depletion of natural resources, with the central objective of the health and wealth of the populations of developed countries. As for the category of deep ecology, this is inserted in environmental ethics as an ecocentric perspective, with some traces of egalitarian biocentrism, being a perspective that encourages environmental activism.

Aiming to answer the deepest questions regarding the current questions about the environmental problem, typical of superficial environmentalist perspectives, Rodrigues explains that for Naess, the deep questioning about the truth and the meaning of things is what will allow to reach the potential for self-realization, not under the selfish aspect of personal fulfillment, but in an expansion of oneself to a whole, as an extension of the natural world, the realization of the self in a Self. This feeling of belonging to an organic whole, encourages the feeling of care and compassion for all the forms of life (RODRIGUES, 2012, p. 6).

Therefore, Naess's vision is identifiable (RODRIGUES, 2012, p. 28) from the perspective of attributing intrinsic value to all beings and the preservation of a whole to the detriment of an individual being, an "I" of organic totality that mirrors a conscience in cosmic communion with all beings, a thinking that all things in the biosphere have an equal right to live and flourish, and to reach their own individual unfolded forms, that is, the right to self-realization.

Naess's proposal is not a simply adjustment of Western culture, which recognizes injustices towards animals or the damage caused to the environment, that is, only an ethics, but raises the image of a nature that is always in competition. It is proposed to design a new paradigm, a philosophical system called ecosophy, which deals with all aspects that contribute to form a complex world view, that is,

The word ecosophy is composed of the Greek terms oikos and sophia (house and wisdom). As for ecology, eco has a meaning that goes beyond that immediate of home, family and community. The most appropriate translation would be "Earth House". Therefore, an ecosophy is nothing more than a global vision (or system) of a philosophical type inspired by living conditions in the eco-sphere (NAESS, 1994, p. 29-30).

From this perspective, Arne Naess' proposal is more than an ethics, it is a maturing process that places the individual as an integral part of the Universe. The human being, therefore, is one more element of the natural community, but with the added responsibility of being aware of his actions and the consequences that result.

Thus, mankind is not only a species of the natural and complex system, since the values of nature preservation are rooted within himself as part of his conduct, therefore, he does not need to resort to a morality produced by society itself in which is inserted, but, seek to be responsible and solidary in its actions in living with the environment so that it can contribute to the sustainable development of life together on earth.

Therefore, based on deep ecology, understanding Ecosophy implies that the individual must be receptive and responsible for the needs of the place where he / she is inserted, of his/her "Earth house", with all beings and with the respective community, remembering that this knowledge comprises norms, rules and hypotheses according to the diverse universal experiences.

5 Final Considerations

Among several currents of ecological and philosophical thoughts, in the proposed debate, some theoretical fronts were brought together, but not deprived of their specificities, a coherent content capable of showing a future for ecology with its ecosophical based assumptions, through a solidary and effectively ecological perception.

What each individual and each community has always done and will always do is to inhabit, to inhabit a place, in a place, and in the ways forged by the same place and the community in which it lives.

Faced with the issue that denounces man's destructive action on nature, historically, the evolution of the ecological debate has shown that the traditional repertoire built around the concept of ecology has found its wear. However, the absence of a coherent and affirmative position in the face of such a problem, allowed the emergence of new debates and the birth of a new ecological paradigm.

In this sense, through the composition of a new paradigm proposed by Fritjof Capra and allied to the development of Naess's *deep ecology*, the ecosophy (Guattari and Naess) appears to re-found the bases of ethics, scientific epistemology, politics and society in a perspective complex.

In these terms, the *ecosophy* establishes, therefore, a new paradigm capable, on the one hand, of placing the human individual as an integral part of the Universe and no longer as the traditional predator at the top of the food chain, subjecting all nature under the power of technical and scientific progress. On the other hand, nature itself also assumes a new dignity as an equally integral part of the whole.

Therefore, in a relationship of interdependence between mankind and nature, *ecosophy* and *deep ecology* emerge as a new ecological and sustainable paradigm to make effective the practice of an ethical acquaintanceship that understands nature not only as a mean of existence, but fundamentally as an integral part of the natural community, alongside the human community.

References

- ARENDDT, Hannah. *A condição humana*. São Paulo: Forense Universitária, 2010.
- BRAGA, Isaque Trevisam. *Por uma vivência planetária eco-lógica: diálogos interfilosóficos em torno de uma ética da responsabilidade*. 2015. 106 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Filosofia). Pontifícia Universidade Católica de São Paulo. São Paulo, 2015.
- CAPRA, F. *A teia da vida: uma nova compreensão científica dos sistemas vivos*. Tradução de Newton Roberval Eicheberg. São Paulo: Cultrix, 2006.
- ESPINOSA, Baruch. *Ética: trattato teologico-politico*. Tradução do autor. Turim: Utet, 2005.
- ESPINOSA, Baruch. *Ética*. Tradução de Joaquim de Carvalho. São Paulo: Abril Cultural, 1973.
- GUATTARI, Félix. *As três ecologias*. Tradução de Maria F. Bittencourt, 21. Ed. Campinas: Papyrus, 2012.
- GORDILHO, Heron J. de S.; SILVA, Raissa P. Os animais, a natureza e as três ecofilosofias. *Revista de Biodireito e Direitos dos Animais*. v. 2, n. 1, Brasília, jan./jun., 2016, p.1-19.
- GORDILHO, Heron J. de S.; SILVA, Tagore T. de A.; RAVAZZANO, Fernanda. Animais e a hermenêutica constitucional abolicionista. *Revista Acadêmica*. Faculdade de Direito do Recife. v. 88, n. 2, jul./dez., 2016.
- KUHN, Thomas S. *The structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.
- LEFF, Enrique. *Epistemologia ambiental*. Tradução de Sandra Valenzuela. 5. ed. São Paulo: Cortez, 2010.
- NAESS, Arne. *Ecosofia. Ecologia, società e stili di vita*. Tradução do autor. Como: Red, 1994.
- NAESS, Arne. *Il movimento ecologico: ecologia superficiale ed ecologia profonda. Una sintesi*. Tradução italiana de M. Tallacchini. Tradução em português do autor. Milão: Vita e Pensiero, 1998.
- RODRIGUES, Vera Mónica dos S. *Deep Ecology: princípios, fundamentos e fins*. 2012. 89 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Ecologia Humana e Problemas Sociais contemporâneos). Universidade Nova de Lisboa. Lisboa, 2012.
- SINGER, Peter. *Ética prática*. Tradução de Jefferson Luiz Camargo. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 1998.
- SINGER, Peter. *Liberazione animale*. Tradução do autor. Milão: Il Saggiatore, 2010.
- SCHELLING, Friedrich W. J. *Sistema dell'idealismo trascendentale*. Tradução do autor. Milão: Bompiani, 2006.
- VIOLA, Francesco. *Stato vincoli natura. XIX Congresso Nazionale della Società Italiana di Filosofia Giuridica e Politica*, Trento – Itália, 29-30 set. 1994.