

Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw
Institute of Philosophy
Center for Ecology and Ecophilosophy

STUDIA ECOLOGIAE ET BIOETHICAE



20/1 (2022)

Good and Justice in the Context of Environmental Ethics

Dobro i sprawiedliwość w kontekście etyki środowiskowej

Nikolai Mihailov¹, Lidia Sakelarieva²

¹ Faculty of Journalism and Mass Communication, Sofia University "St. Kliment Ohridski", Bulgaria

² Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences, South-West University "Neofit Rilski", Blagoevgrad, Bulgaria

ORCID NM <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3020-7013>; LS <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9779-3075> • nikolajkm@uni-sofia.bg

Received: 21 Feb, 2022; Revised: 21 Mar, 2022; Accepted: 22 Mar, 2022

Abstract: The article is an attempt to review some basic ethical concepts in their historical and substantive development, within the context of the environment and environmental knowledge. It also tries to answer the question whether there is a difference between traditional and environmental ethics. The comparative-historical method is used, which considers some classical ethical concepts and their interpretations related to the environment. The concepts of classical and modern scientists are also analyzed. The authors consider whether these concepts should be supplemented with new content in this area or should be reformulated in terms of moral relevance not only for the human community, but also for all non-human inhabitants of the environment. The article explores issues about the origin of morality, as well as some ideas about the moral status of attitudes among primates. More important conclusions are that ethics and environmental knowledge must be developed in cooperation in order to explain and form moral consciousness, a new type of ethos that does not allow indifference to the environment in human interaction with it, and that moral considerations should contain not only prescriptions for due human behavior in human society, but also obligations to non-human inhabitants of nature or to the environment.

Keywords: environment, society, environmental justice, ecology, morality

Streszczenie: Artykuł jest próbą przeglądu podstawowych koncepcji etycznych w ich historycznym i merytorycznym rozwoju w kontekście środowiska i wiedzy o środowisku. Próbuje również odpowiedzieć na pytanie, czy istnieje różnica między etyką tradycyjną a etyką środowiskową. Wykorzystywana jest metoda porównawczo-historyczna, która uwzględnia niektóre klasyczne koncepcje etyczne i ich interpretację związaną ze środowiskiem. Analizowane są również koncepcje myślicieli klasycznych i współczesnych uczonych. Autorzy zastanawiają się, czy koncepcje te należy uzupełnić o nowe treści w tym zakresie, czy też przeformułować pod kątem moralnego znaczenia nie tylko dla społeczności ludzkiej, ale także dla wszystkich istot pozaludzkich. Artykuł porusza kwestie pochodzenia moralności, a także niektóre koncepcje dotyczące statusu moralnego postaw wśród naczelnych. Ważniejsze wnioski są takie, że dla rozwoju etyk i wiedzy o środowisku potrzebna jest ich współpraca w celu wyjaśnienia i ukształtowania świadomości moralnej, nowego typu etosu, który nie pozwala na obojętność człowieka wobec środowiska, a rozważania moralne powinny zawierać nie tylko recepty na należyte zachowanie człowieka w społeczeństwie ludzkim, ale także zobowiązania wobec istot pozaludzkich.

Słowa kluczowe: środowisko, społeczeństwo, sprawiedliwość środowiskowa, ekologia, moralność

Introduction

Environmental problems and their influence on society are becoming an object of increased scientific research both by scholars dealing with science and those from the area of humanities. These problems affect not only nature and its inhabitants, but also the human environment by setting questions that have moral, political or even aesthetic dimensions. For a long time, these issues were considered significant only for the social environment; it was also accepted that they were not directly related to nature and man's relationship with it. According to environmental science, however, man's relationship with nature is much more complex and it is not possible to limit human values and ideals only to the social environment. Ethics, as a branch of philosophy has a long history of study into the main categories that describe a person's behavior and moral qualities. These ideas are part of human culture and underlie human relationships and the overall social community.

The development of technology, rapid economic progress that requires more and more natural resources, the imposition of consumer attitudes to nature and the restriction of moral regulation mainly (or only) to human relations led to the deprivation of nature in status and moral object or, in other words, to almost full permissiveness of people in their relations with the natural environment. This attitude has led to what is now called an ecological crisis, which obviously affects not only nature but also the future of man, human culture, and civilization.

The joint efforts of scientists, politicians, researchers, or civil society organizations are not enough to solve the issues raised by this crisis. For science, we think, this means first of all to unite the research of scholars having different profiles – natural, social, humanitarian – in order to rethink the basic scientific paradigms in which they work and search for a common solution of theoretical and practical significance. It is important for ethics to include in its scope the issues of the regulatory power of morality not only

in relation to human behavior in society but also in relation to what is defined as the environment and its inhabitants. For ecology as scientific knowledge, furthermore, this means development as transdisciplinary knowledge, which should include various social and moral issues in its research about changes in the environment, often negative in terms of species diversity, climate change, resources depletion, etc. The article is an attempt to show how some of the basic moral concepts of ethics can be reconsidered in their significance both in the context to human relationships, and in their notability for the environment that depends on human decisions.

1. Moral philosophy and the problem of the environment

The main ethical concepts have been developed with the advancement of moral philosophy. Reflections on the nature of good and evil have always accompanied philosophical thinking about morality and the requirements for rules or norms that govern human behavior. The pursuit of the “good life”, this ancient ideal of ethics, has always been part of the idea of social and personal progress. And the reflection of this striving can be found not only in ethics but also in science, education, politics, economics. However, can we define environmental ethics in a similar way? “Traditional Ethics looks for respect of borders in human life and in the sphere of human relations, though the ethics of respect for life teaches to respect every form of life, it teaches compassion towards every life, and perceives the secret of life as of the greatest value not enough appreciated man” (Kaliský and Kaliská 2020, 31).

A problem arises when we want to apply ethical concepts to environmental ethics – first, because the term “ethics” in the expression “environmental ethics” does not refer to the same thing as in “William's notion of ethics” as some scholars pointed out. Bernard Williams is a British philosopher, whose conception of ethics, according

to these authors is described as a collection of all elements that are relevant for answering Socrates' question how one should live. The first [ethics] points to a particular kind of philosophical theory, whereas the second [environmental ethics] points to what we will call "ethical experience" (Van Tongeren and Snellen 2014, 298).

Progress has social and moral dimensions, it is also associated with improving the quality of people's lives, sometimes, and even more recently, at the expense of human "domination" over nature. Nature in this context can be understood as the environment in which a person acts, which is different from itself and is defined as "natural" or as a "natural state". The Latin word *natura* conveys the meaning of the Greek (and Aristotelian) concept of *physis*, i.e., something that grows (Orhan 2014, 48).

Ethics, at least in the European cultural tradition, is, first of all, a philosophy, a reflection on what is the right and free choice of means to achieve personal and social goals, what are the basic concepts through which morality can be defined as a phenomenon of human presence and what are those higher values (ideals) that determine our immediate existence. Ethicists try to answer theoretically the question of which environment shapes human moral ideas and values – whether social (anthropocentrism) or some other – may be natural (biocentrism, ecocentrism, etc.). This important problem has a philosophical character, and it provides the answer to the question of the origin of morality – whether it is social, psychological (emotional) or natural (innate). Ethics in this sense, especially in the conditions of pluralism of modern scientific knowledge, is considered not only a subject of philosophy.

Scientists, biologists, physicists, mathematicians, ecologists, ethologists, etc. are also trying to answer these ethical questions. The reason is that those studying the organization and preservation of life should have an "ethical experience". Frans de Waal, a world-renowned biologist, and researcher

of primate behaviour, in his book *The Bonobo and the Atheist* (Де Вааль 2019) poses the question whether the concept of good should not be explained in natural or biological rather than social terms. De Waal studies the behaviour of bonobo chimpanzees, which are thought to be closest in evolution to humans. In his book, the Dutch scientist describes the behaviour and development of a male chimpanzee of this species named Amos, which he describes as "one of the nicest male beasts I've ever known" (Де Вааль 2019, 41).

Unfortunately, Amos died of cancer, but observing the attitude of other chimpanzees towards him while ill, de Waal concluded that "apes acknowledge and take into account the condition of others, especially when it comes to friends in need" (Де Вааль 2019, 43). From the point of view of theoretical ethics, only that behaviour is moral, which corresponds to or coincides with the norms of good, when it is acceptable, or is of public benefit. According to the researcher, even in natural communities, it is possible to find behaviour that can be described as "moral": "to rely on compassion and help from loved ones, not just relatives" (Де Вааль 2019, 44).

Caring for someone (de Waal calls it empathy and in the case of Amos – altruism) means a form of moral duty, and this moral phenomenon is often considered unique to humans. Let us recall the Decalogue with God's commandment "Thou shalt not kill" or Kant's definition of morality only as "acting as a *good or evil man*, but not one thing that could be called so" (Kant 1998, 193, italics N. M., L. S.). In the history of ethics, morality is described mainly as a phenomenon of human relationships, constituting the origin of human culture (social environment, the world of social institutions), changed by human will as something quite different from the unchanging relations in the natural world, based on the natural laws. Frans de Waal reflects on the manifestations of altruism in animals and humans and comes to interesting conclusions in an ethical

perspective. “If we think from the point of view of genes, altruism acquires a special meaning” (Де Вааль 2019, 48).

In animals, especially in primates and other mammals, there is a genetic concern for the transmission and preservation of genes (kin), which means preservation and transmission of genetic information from generation to generation. Thus, according to this view, evolution could be explained from the point of view of genetics. However, the question arises how this relates to ethics? Is it possible for moral notions to degrade if we accept that the manifestations of concern for our relatives and other people are predetermined by the unconscious and are genetically determined, as de Waal argues? It must be remembered that, according to Aristotle: “Now he who *exercises his reason* and cultivates it seems to be both in the best state of mind and most dear to the gods” (Aristotle 2022a, book 10:8, italics N. M., L. S.).

How then it is possible to define care, sympathy, friendship as a kind of good, if they are inherent in human behaviour only or can be found in general among other representatives of mammals and especially in higher primates. Does morality, therefore, has a biological origin, is a product of evolution, and has a genetic explanation, and therefore, is inherent in humans as a species that has reached the peak of evolutionary development? That is an assumption that seems obviously questionable to proponents of the social explanation of the origin of morality, not to mention religious people (Luke 12:6 “Are not five sparrows sold for two pennies? Yet not one of them is forgotten by God.”) The Dutch scholar cites a statement in his study, which he says is often mentioned as an example in such disputes: “If we reject all sentiments, we must recognize that our view of society is not softened even by a hint of true benevolence...to act in the name of our own interests, nothing but profit will stop a person from cruelty, mutilation and [even] killing – a brother, wife, parent or own child. If you wash the ‘altruist’

you will get a ‘hypocrite’” (Де Вааль 2019, 60).

This is a quote from Michael T. Ghiselin, a modern American biologist and philosopher. De Waal formulates several main arguments of the proponents (scientists and biologists, as well as various intellectuals) of such theories:

- “1. Natural selection is a selfish and disgusting process;
2. It automatically forms selfish and vile beings;
3. Only romantics with wreaths on their heads can think differently.”

According to De Waal, the “height of the absurd” in this respect has been reached by Richard Dawkins, who in 1997 denied Darwin and his evolutionary paradigm (Де Вааль 2019, 62). The big question of whether moral concepts exist in the natural world or whether they are just a phenomenon of the human (social) environment that forms, educates, and directs human actions as different from their biological nature is a problem considered by philosophers, sociologists, biologists, theologians, and physicians alike.

2. Nature and virtue

“I admit that nature has instilled in man a desire for happiness and aversion to unhappiness. These are truly innate practical principles that work (as they should with practical principles) constantly and affect everything we do but they are a manifestation of the pursuit of good, not imprints of truth in the mind” (Locke 2022, book 2:3). Philosophers formulate their own definitions of nature, and likewise, in their intellectual insights, they see problems with human relations with the environment in which people live and seek their self-realization. Aristotle, one of the most famous thinkers in the history of European and world philosophy, is considered one of the first Europeans who were systematically engaged in science. “The environmental relevance of Aristotle’s philosophy can best be appreciated within

his historical and philosophical framework” (Orhan 2014, 47).

Aristotle gives a definition of nature in *Physics*: “For the word ‘nature’ is applied to what is according to nature and the natural in the same way as ‘art’ is applied to what is artistic or a work of art” (Aristotle 2022d, book 2:1). There is no doubt about the interest of the Greek philosopher in studying the living conditions of plants and animals, gathering knowledge and facts about them in a scientific discipline that today can be defined as biology. However, as he also writes, “And the science which knows to what end each thing must be done is the most authoritative of the sciences, and more authoritative than any ancillary science; and this end is the good of that thing, and in general the supreme good in the whole of nature” (Aristotle 2022c, book 1:3). In this sense, Aristotle defines what is necessary to preserve the life of man, which he considers as the organization of economic or material activity of the environment in which people live. In his treatise *Politics*, Aristotle speaks of the “art of acquisition” (chrematistics), which is explained as follows: “1. the art of making a living, (which Aristotle considers as positive), and 2. The art of making money, (which Aristotle considers unnatural and bad)” (Герджиков 1995, 253).

Acquisition (by nature) in order to preserve and expand human presence in society is key to people’s way of life. Nature is the one that people rely on to earn a living and from which they acquire the necessary resources to continue their existence. “In like manner, we may infer that after the birth of animals, plants exist for their sake, and that the other animals exist for the sake of man, the tame for use and food, the wild, if not all at least the greater part of them, for food, and for the provision of clothing and various instruments” (Aristotle 2022b, book 1:8), a statement made from the standpoint of anthropocentrism. From an ecological point of view, animals exist thanks to plants – consumers in a biotic community cannot exist without the presence of producers

or without detritus (dead organic matter), i.e., heterotrophic metabolism is possible due to the existence of autotrophic organisms, especially green plants. Although some scholars reject such a notion of philosophy and ethics defined by Aristotle, regarding it as anthropocentric (Orhan 2014, 52), we cannot fail to notice the importance of the relationship between human presence in the world and nature, on which the Greek philosopher reflects. Nature is subordinate to man, or rather, man is superior to natural things because of his ability to improve and develop morally.

Contrary to the ideas shared above about the natural sources of morality, Aristotle assumes that it is an entirely and solely human quality, different from all natural endowments and dispositions. “It is clear from this that none of our ethical virtues are innate in nature; for nothing of the things which exist by nature is accustomed to exist in any other way, such as the stone which by nature is carried downwards cannot be accustomed to rise... therefore, neither by nature nor by nature are virtues innate to us, but by nature we are gifted to acquire them for ourselves and to become perfect in them” (Aristotle 2022a book 2:1).

Practice and human activity are what define us as human beings, and it is entirely in our power to choose good over evil through the right decisions and actions. This choice is an expression of people’s preference for a “good life”, while “to live well means to live a virtuous life”. As regards humans’ interaction with their habitat and the concept of a good life, Aristotle places moral constraints on the pursuit of infinite appropriation of natural resources, just because a reasonable (and virtuous) man cannot have infinite enrichment as his ultimate goal. Acquisition through appropriation of natural resources is necessary for human life – “for no man can live well, or indeed live at all, unless he is provided with necessaries” (Aristotle 2022b book 1:4) but it must be moderate and must not turn into supremacy. The latter is permissible in politics and

social relations, rather than in nature, because there it is not good in an ethical sense. The Greek philosopher was one of the first thinkers to present ethical arguments for preserving the natural state of the environment and limiting human consumption motivated by material reasons, an idea that is now called sustainability. In other words, Aristotle presents an alternative to later philosophical and political ideas that instrumentalize nature and try to justify the unlimited consumption of its resources (Orhan 2014, 59).

3. Nature and justice

One of the names of scientists and researchers that is almost always mentioned when we think about the ethical issues about human's relationship with the environment is that of Aldo Leopold. In one of his essays, he writes: "We abuse land because we regard it as a commodity belonging to us. When we see land as a community to which we belong, we may begin to use it with love and respect" (Cunningham and Cunningham 2011, 22). David Hume is another world-famous figure in the history of philosophy and ethics, associated with the ideas of justice in the context of people's attitudes towards the environment they inhabit. One of the dimensions of environmental justice is, for example, the care for future generations, a problem that the Scottish philosopher also thinks about. "The concept of future generations is central to environmental ethics and environmental policy, because the health and well-being of human beings depend on how people living today care for the natural environment" (Ball 2011, 722).

Hume also substantiates his theory of virtues entirely in the field of human nature, in other words, for him, they are something inherent in man. Hume argues: "that no action can be virtuous, or morally good, unless there be in human nature some motive to produce it, distinct from the sense of its morality" (Hume 2022, book 3 part 2:1). Because man, according to the Scottish thinker, is a sensory being, morality is based on

sensory perception and reaction of our sensory and bodily nature. Similar is Hume's definition of justice, which he relates to human corporeality. "Our embodiment means, for Hume, that we are surrounded by other human beings like ourselves, whose passions and feelings affect us through the mechanism of sympathy... [and we] as embodied creatures – as animals – we have much in common with other animals" (Valls 2014, 118).

If we agree with Hume that justice means compliance with others or with the general, then we do not observe such compliance in nature (and very rarely in men because "men attach themselves so much to their possessions") and therefore justice is an "artificial virtue": "the sense of justice and injustice is not derived from nature, but arises artificially, though necessarily from education, and human conventions" (Hume 2022, book 3 part 2:1). Or, as Valls notes: "Rather they are [moral – N.M., L.S.] norms that have evolved to solve the problem of distribution of goods" (Valls 2014, 118).

Therefore, according to Hume, moral norms are conventional in nature and are based on negotiation between people, from which the latter have a common benefit. "This convention is not of the nature of a promise: For even promises themselves, as we shall see afterwards, arise from human conventions. It is only a general sense of common interest; which sense all the members of the society express to one another, and which induces them to regulate their conduct by certain rules" (Hume 2022, book 3 part 2:2). This also applies to the attitude towards nature, especially in relation to the ownership or possession of its resources. Therefore, any agreements regarding natural possessions can be changed depending on human interest, if it could be arranged to be mutual. "Here then is a proposition, which, I think, may be regarded as certain, that it is only from the selfishness and confined generosity of men, along with the scanty provision nature has made for his wants, that justice derives its origin" (Hume

2022, book 3 part 2:2). A concept of moral categories and norms that is different from the one presented at the beginning of this article. “In [his] work, Darwin argues, for example, that morality grows directly from the social instincts of animals, and notes that it would be absurd to speak of these instincts as derivatives of selfishness” (Де Вааль 2019, 64).

Valls concludes that because of the emphasis on interest and compliance with that of other participants in a process, Hume’s theory of justice can be described not only as liberal – “a strong conception of property rights has been a major obstacle to environmental regulation” (Valls 2014, 122), but also as eco-friendly, precisely because it sets (places is not necessary) serious limits on arbitrary disposal of nature by people. Regulation and compliance with strict rules are the basis of fairness (equity) in the use of natural resources. E.g., although atmospheric air is considered a renewable resource, it is known today, it can accumulate pollutants that harm living organisms, including human health or intensify climate change. Therefore, according to Valls, a country or group of countries could pass a law or laws (regulations) to control or limit the release of carbon compounds into the atmosphere, and this would be entirely in line with Hume’s theory of justice for natural resources as property regulation (Valls 2014, 122).

This conclusion leads us to Aldo Leopold’s theory, in which he shares his ideas about the relationship between man and nature. “It is, by common consent, a good thing for people to get back to nature” (Leopold 2020, 155). Leopold notes that ethics and its concepts are based on acceptance of human individuality. “All ethics so far evolved rest upon a single premise: that the individual is a member of a community of interdependent parts” (Leopold 2020, 192). Leopold’s protected position is insistence on the need to perceive the environment as a whole, as an integral unity of all its parts, including those that people do not perceive as important for their social presence. “The land ethic

simply enlarges the boundaries of the community to include soils, waters, plants, and animals, or collectively: the land” (Leopold 2020, 192). Ethics always aims at ensuring the stability and protection of a community, but the main question here is who is involved in it. “In short, a land ethic changes the role of *Homo sapiens* from conqueror of the land – community to plain member and citizen of it. It implies respect for his fellow-members, and also respect for the community as such” (Leopold 2020, 192).

Leopold’s claims are based on his observations of the interactions among members of the new type of community that he offers. Here one can find a parallel between Leopold’s and Hume’s ideas – about the possible community between humans and animals, based on their fleshliness and the necessary obligations to animals and nature that follow from this commonality. “This is necessary Leopold says, because ecological science tells us that living organisms are mutually dependent on one another within ecosystems, often in ways that we don’t fully understand. It isn’t enough to treat individual organisms with justice; we must extend moral consideration to whole ecosystems” (Valls 2014, 127).

Conclusions

Considering the above, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. Philosophy and ethics in their history have been interested in the problems of the environment and the due attitude of people to it as an important part of the moral worldview.
2. Moral considerations should contain not only prescriptions for due human behavior in human society, but also obligations to non-human inhabitants of nature or to the environment.
3. Ethics and environmental knowledge must be developed in cooperation in order to explain and form a moral consciousness, a new type of ethos that does not allow indifference to the environment in human interaction with it.

The issues of ethics and ecology that arise when we engage in the study of moral issues in the environment or the research of ethical concepts in this context are relatively new and require original approaches. This also applies to basic ideas in moral philosophy such as good, evil, justice, freedom, responsibility, progress, etc. A brief overview of the changing ethical concepts in the context of environmentalism tells us that both ethics and ecology must work together to clarify them. Especially in the light of the process of continually developing technologies related to the extraction of natural raw materials or those that benefit the industry but are almost catastrophic for the environment and its non-human inhabitants. Should ethical concepts accept new content in this area or do they need to be reformulated in terms of caring for the communities of people and other non-human inhabitants.

On the one hand, these concepts are based on the works of influential philosophers, but on the other, environmental consciousness requires interaction between scientists from different fields. Any attitudes towards the environment that are devoid of an ethical approach can be destructive for that environment, but also for people – practitioners, theorists, who have adopted them. Such questions again raise the need for further scientific research on fundamental problems such as the origin of morality, human nature, or the natural-social relationship. A responsible attitude towards different biological species, as well as their preservation, and moral relevance to the environment is a topic that is to be considered by ethicists, ecologists, biologists, and philosophers.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, N.M. and L.S.; Methodology, N.M. and L.S.; Validation, N.M. and L.S.; Writing – Original Draft Preparation, N.M. and L.S.; Writing – Review & Editing, N.M. and L.S. Both authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- Aristotle. 2022a. *Nicomachean Ethics*. Translated by W.D. Ross. Accessed March 03, 2022. <http://classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/nicomachaen.html>.
- Aristotle. 2022b. *Politics*. Translated by Benjamin Jowett. Accessed March 03, 2022. <http://classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/politics.html>.
- Aristotle. 2022c. *Metaphysics*. Translated by W.D. Ross. Accessed March 03, 2022. <http://classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/metaphysics.html>.
- Aristotle. 2022d. *Physics*. Translated by R.P. Hardie and R.K. Gaye. Accessed March 03, 2022. <http://classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/physics.html>.
- Ball, Terence. 2011. "Future generations." In *Environmental encyclopaedia*, 4th ed. vol. 1, 722-723.
- Cannavò, Peter F., Joseph H. Lane, and John Barry. 2014. *Engaging Nature: Environmentalism and the Political Theory Canon*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Clingerman, Forrest, Martin Drenthen, Brian Treanor, and David Utsler. 2014. *Interpreting Nature. The emerging field of Environmental Hermeneutics*. New York: Fordham University Press.
- Cunningham, William, and Mary Cunningham. 2011. *Principles of Environmental Science: Inquiry and Applications*, 6th ed. McGraw-Hill.
- Hume, David. 2022. *A Treatise of Human Nature*. Accessed March 03, 2022. <https://www.gutenberg.org/files/4705/4705-h/4705-h.htm>.
- Kaliský, Ján, and Lada Kaliská. 2020. "Man's Attitude Towards Nature and Animal Respect Questionnaire (AniRe-Que)." *Studia Ecologiae et Bioethicae* 18(4): 29-37. <https://doi.org/10.21697/seb.2020.18.4.03>.
- Kant, Immanuel. 1998. *Critique of Pure Reason*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Leopold, Aldo. 2020. *A Sand County Almanac: And Sketches Here and There*. Oxford University Press.
- Locke, John. 2022. *An Essay Concerning Humane Understanding*. Accessed March 03, 2022 <https://>

- www.gutenberg.org/files/10615/10615-h/10615-h.htm.
- Orhan, Özgüç. 2014. "Aristotle: Phusis, Praxis, and the Good." In *Engaging nature. Environmentalism and the Political Theory Canon*, edited by Peter F. Cannavò, Joseph H. Lane, and John Barry, 45-64. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Valls, Andrew. 2014. "David Hume: Justice and the Environment." In *Engaging nature. Environmentalism and the Political Theory Canon*, edited by Peter F. Cannavò, Joseph H. Lane, and John Barry, 117-133. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Van Tongeren, Paul, and Paulien Snellen. 2014. "How Hermeneutics Might Save the Life of (Environmental) Ethics." In *Interpreting Nature. The emerging field of Environmental Hermeneutics*, edited by Forrest Clingerman, Martin Drenthen, Brian Treanor, and David Utsler, 297-313. New York: Fordham University Press.
- Герджиков, Атанас. 1995. "Бележки." В Аристотел, Политика, редактор Богдан Богданов, 245-287. София: Фондация "Отворено общество". [Gerdzhikov, Atanas. 1995. "Notes". In *Aristotle, Politics*, edited by Bogdan Bogdanov, 245-287. Sofia: Foundation Open Society].
- Де Вааль, Франс. 2019. Истоки морали: В поисках человеческого у приматов. Москва: Альпина нон-фикшн. [De Waal, Frans. 2014. *The Bonobo and the Atheist. In Search of Humanism among the Primates*. New York: W.W. Norton].