

Biophilic Philosophy of Josef Šmajš

Biofilna filozofia Josefa Šmajša

Jan Lída^{1,2}, Ladislav Rozenský^{1,2}, Petr Ondrušák^{1,2}, Zdeněk Vrba^{1,2}, Josef Dolista^{1,3}

¹ Institute for Medical Humanities, Charles University in Prague, Czech Republic

² Middle West University, Prague, Czech Republic

³ Department of Philosophy, Pavol Jozef Šafárik University in Košice, Slovakia

ORCID JL <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5791-9574>; LR <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0439-8776>; PO <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3708-0203>;

ZV <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9023-6073>; JD <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2219-4822> • jan.lida@centrum.cz

Received: 07 Apr, 2022; Revised: 14 May, 2022; Accepted: 17 May, 2022

Abstract: In the field of ecoethics, in addition to names such as Kohák, Vavroušek, Keller, and Librová, we are increasingly encountering the name of a Czech philosopher, Professor Josef Šmajš. In his works, Professor Šmajš presents an entirely new, original, and comprehensive view of human life on Earth and its ethics. His concept combines the humanities and natural sciences into a single organic whole. Šmajš declares: "We are the products of a magnificent natural evolution, but we are proud only of our cultural creativity. We think – and we teach it in schools – that we complete humanity with human culture and humanize it. However, the truth is different. Nature is original, self-sufficient, and perfect; we cannot complete or humanize it." He further claims that "If we want to survive on Earth, we must wisely give way to nature wisely in time. The epoch of the symbiosis of culture and nature is still ahead of us." His philosophy, which can be called biophilic, interprets the current form of the ecological crisis and its causes and provides a clear, realistic guide to saving humanity and life on earth in ethical manner.

Keywords: bioethics, ethics, culture, ecology, evolution, Josef Šmajš

Streszczenie: W dziedzinie etyki ekologicznej, oprócz takich nazwisk jak Kohák, Vavroušek, Keller, Librová, coraz częściej spotykamy się z nazwiskiem czeskiego filozofa Josefa Šmajša. Profesor Šmajš w swoich pracach przedstawia nowe, oryginalne i całościowe spojrzenie na życie człowieka na Ziemi i jego etykę. Proponowana przez niego koncepcja łączy nauki humanistyczne i przyrodnicze w jedną organiczną całość. Šmajš stwierdza wręcz: „jesteśmy wytworem wspaniałej ewolucji biologicznej, ale jesteśmy dumni tylko z naszej kreatywności kulturowej. Myślimy – i uczymy tego w szkołach – że dopełniamy człowieczeństwo ludzką kulturą i humanizujemy je. Jednak prawda jest inna, Przyroda jest oryginalna, samowystarczalna i doskonała; nie możemy jej dopełnić ani uczłowieczyć”. Dalej Šmajš twierdzi, że „jeżeli chcemy przetrwać na Ziemi, musimy mądrze ustąpić miejsca przyrodzie, musimy to zrobić w odpowiednim czasie. Epoka symbiozy kultury i przyrody jest jeszcze wciąż przed nami”. Filozofia Šmajša, którą można określić jako biofilną, interpretuje obecne przejawy kryzysu ekologicznego, jego przyczyny oraz dostarcza jasnego, realistycznego przewodnika do ratowania człowieczeństwa i wszystkich form życia w sposób etyczny.

Słowa kluczowe: bioetyka, etyka, kultura, ekologia, ewolucja, Josef Šmajš

Introduction

Van R. Potter was the first to use the term “bioethics”. In his *Bioethics – Bridge to the Future* (Prentice Hall Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey 1971), Potter pointed out that no distinction was made between ethical issues related to man’s ethical relationship and his environmental problems related to his healthcare. Later, the terms “ecoethics” and “bioethics” have been used.

Ecologists, Kohák, Vavroušek, Keller, and Librova deal with ecoethics in our environment. The name of a Czech philosopher and thinker, Professor Josef Šmajš, whose work will be discussed in this paper also frequently begins to appear in this context. This work has been divided into three parts. The first part introduces the basic ideas of Šmajš’s work. The second part discusses the practical issues of the need for change. The third part compares the scientists work with other authors. In his works published since the mid-1990s, Professor Šmajš presents an entirely new, original, and comprehensive view of human life on Earth and its ethics. His concept combines the humanities and natural sciences as it perceives them as a single organic whole. His philosophy, which can be called biophilic, as he calls the new policy necessary to change the thinking of modern humanity leading to the preservation of life on Earth, not only explains the current form of ecological crisis and its causes but also provides a clear, realistic guide to saving humanity and earthly life in general, ethically.

1. Philosopher Josef Šmajš

1.1. About Josef Šmajš

Josef Šmajš was born in 1938 in Skvrňov, district of Kolín. In 1969, he studied mechanical engineering at the Military Academy in Brno and, in 1972, philosophy at the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University in Brno. In 1986, he was appointed associate professor of philosophy; in 1993, he was awarded a habilitation based on the work “Evolutionary Ontology”, and in 1997, he was appointed

professor of philosophy at Masaryk University in Brno (Databazeknih.cz 2022).

The main areas of his scientific interest comprise philosophical issues related to the crisis of civilization, which he understands as a conflict of culture with nature. Josef Šmajš created an original philosophical conception of evolutionary ontology and is the author of numerous publications on ontological and ecological topics, translated into other languages. In 1995, he published the book *Endangered Culture*, for which he received the Award of the Minister of the Environment of the Czech Republic. He is the author of several dozen books.

1.2. Šmajš’ conception of philosophy

In his conception, Šmajš rarely refers to interdisciplinary studies. He repeatedly argues in his books that the solution for the current global ecological crisis is not a science, but de facto he says that natural sciences should examine the issues of cultural relations and the humanities of nature.

“We are the products of a magnificent natural evolution, but we are proud only of our cultural creativity. We think – and we teach it in schools – that we complete humanity with human culture, that we humanize it. However, the truth is different. Nature is original, self-sufficient, and perfect; we cannot complete or humanize it” (Šmajš 2011b, 7).

As with the essence of every complex cultural phenomenon, the essence of the global ecological crisis is not shown directly but can be revealed by adopting an appropriate theoretical approach. According to Šmajš, we will not understand this essence either in a pragmatic or in a traditional philosophical subject-object way. However, we can address it from the point of view of evolutionary ontology (Šmajš 2003, 16).

Thus, evolutionary ontology attempts to create a new image of the world and man, a new non-anthropocentric cosmology. Nevertheless, it should be neither physical cosmology nor biological cosmology. It is supposed to be a consistently philosophical

cosmology, which respects the reality in its real structure, i.e., as a conflict between two ontically creative evolutionary processes: spontaneous natural activities and human sociocultural activities (Šmajs and Krob 2003, 124).

1.3. Predatory paradigm of culture

In his work, Šmajs criticizes the state of contemporary society. He points to current influences and trends not only in society but also in culture and politics. Rather than using the term “civilization”, which he considers vague and, Šmajs uses the term “culture”, in the historical sense. With its development, man deviates from nature and from the “natural” way of life lived in accordance with nature.

“A culture of needs is emerging, primarily created and imposed on people by developing science, technology, and production” (Šmajs 2011b, 71). Gradually, there is a development of culture and society based on the extraction of natural resources and, at the same time, depletion of the planet.

One of the new terms he introduces and interprets is the predatory paradigm of culture, the complex systemic form of contemporary globalized culture. This is a fact that man does not live in harmony with nature, but through his culture depletes natural resources in the false belief that man is no longer part of nature (Šmajs 2011b, 71). In this context, natural values are replaced by cultural values.

Šmajs disagrees with current theories of growth indicators, denies the importance and role of the economy, which he sees as one of the causes of the crisis, and suggests solving the problem by starting to pay nature for its resources. Although he disagrees with the statement that we live on debt, he claims that we are preparing some existential issues for our descendants (Šmajs 2011b, 83).

1.4. Global ecological crisis

According to Šmajs, such a development immediately leads to a global ecological crisis,

in which, according to the current view of many ecologists and scientists, the Earth and society, or rather culture, have found themselves. This crisis has a devastating impact not only on the Earth but also society as a whole. It can then bring and claim to bring an irreversible end to society. However, as Šmajs postulates, knowledge of the very cause, gradual development, and the possibility of a turn for the better cannot be achieved by traditional sciences.

The scientist studied technology and philosophy and throughout his life, he dealt with the philosophy of science, whereby he combines natural or technical sciences with humanities in his work and life. In this way, therefore, future science is to set out to examine the present state of malignancy and begin to correct it. Only in this way can we come to new knowledge and new results, progress, and further development. The technical sciences have reached their peak on the one hand and are the cause of the crisis on the other, so they should be reformed.

According to his concept, Šmajs sees as the culprit not only science and philosophy but also politics and political science, in the first place the free market and liberalism itself. Moreover, it does not presuppose a change that would lead from the individual by changing his conception, attitude, etc., but de facto above all “from above”, i.e., through philosophers, educators, and politicians acting on the broad masses. It is an essentially illiberal attitude, but they do not hide it, and liberalism often denies it. On the other hand, his teachings radiate a strong social and societal subtext.

Nevertheless, we can find evidence in his work of the validity of the much-hated liberalism emanating from the bourgeois revolution, which is the very cause of the state of the last two centuries.

It is his opinion that the global crisis itself will lead to a tendency to liberate humanity. However, this is a somewhat revolutionary view of his work, confirming liberalism, to which we will return (Šmajs 2011b, 139).

1.5. Evolutionary ontology

Evolutionary ontology can be briefly characterized as an ontology of civic and sociocultural engagement. It is not only about what a being is and what is its structure, but also about what kind of human being arises in the evolutionary process, and what kind of human being can have a chance of living well and in the longer perspective as a biological species. Therefore, evolutionary ontology strives for a competent, scientifically testable ontological reflection of reality for experts and new metaphors, *bon mots*, and interpretive schemes for the general public. It seeks to offer a new ontological minimum to all citizens (Šmajš and Krob 2003, 349).

In his work, Šmajš presents a new science-based field dealing with a synthesis of natural sciences and humanities, a field in which it is possible to combine knowledge of the laws of development and the possibility of reversal. In addition to describing natural evolution, he explains cultural evolution that arises within the process of natural evolution (Šmajš 2011b, 33).

Evolutionary ontology thus tries to respond to the ecological turning point; it wants to show the cause of the incompatibility of nature and culture. It attempts to eliminate anthropocentrism and thematize the contradictory role of culture in the fragile biotic community of the Earth. Therefore, the program is not based on man as a modern focus of philosophy, but again on being, on the process of natural evolution, which created the Earth and man and which also carries, includes, and limits today's planetary culture. Moreover, what it wants to help change is the traditional pre-ecological paradigm. The paradigm of human supremacy over nature is an anthropocentric illusion and must be replaced by the paradigm of human superiority over nature. We must try to transform the anti-natural culture that ravages the Earth radically, postulates Šmajš (Šmajš and Krob 1994, 88).

Drawing on an interdisciplinary evolutionary ontology of culture, Šmajš makes statements that may be surprising for

contemporary science and philosophy, yet it is undoubtedly an acceptable solution for many ecologically minded people. At the same time, this term is the title of one of his books and the central idea of his work.

2. Natural versus cultural evolution

2.1. The relationship between natural and cultural evolution

From an evolutionary ontological perspective, it is necessary to distinguish between natural evolution and cultural evolution consistently. Natural evolution, which is about as old as the universe itself, takes place throughout the time that separates us from the Big Bang, from the singularity. It created all the galaxies, all the stars, and their planetary systems (Binka, Šmajš, and Timko 2011, 37).

Although cultural evolution is qualitatively different from natural evolution, it relies on a different activity and other constitutive information – even with a significant share of deliberate theoretical human activity but is also blind in principle. Like biotic evolution, cultural evolution uses the model of testing its creations by complex environmental (especially cultural) conditions. It uses a generally valid biological method of empirical transformation of “genotype to phenotype” to optimize its constructions. Furthermore, this is why cultural evolution is also relatively unique and cannot proceed according to a rational plan or scenario (Binka, Šmajš, and Timko 2011, 37).

However, we should also know that the dramatic turning point in the relationship of nature and culture does not occur with the failure of the current adaptive human strategy. On the contrary, that reversal is caused by its successful planetary boom, which is only remotely similar to predator-catching prey. The crisis, the essence of which we do not see directly, arises from the loss of naturally arranged structures, places, and spheres of the final Earth's surface. It is created as a result of the extinction of the level of natural being to which man

evolutionarily corresponds because he gave birth to him (Šmajs 2003, 54).

After all, Šmajs devotes an independent work to this topic called *The Natural Conflict and cultural evolution* (Šmajs 1997, 48).

2.2. Subjectivity of the Earth

A very striking cause that emerged during the development of society is the role of work as a factor of production. At this point, Šmajs denies the work the added value that Marx and others, for example, have given it. He constantly repeats the equation of conservation of energy, by which he explains, or rather only suggests, the mistake of exaggerating the meaning of work on the one hand and transformed matter on the other. It is concluded that the reason for this misunderstanding is to deny the subjectivity of the Earth or nature as such. While any legal entity has subjectivity for us, we are unwilling to acknowledge it to the Earth. However, it would be an ethical solution.

Šmajs also discusses the question of who owns the Earth, to which we deny subjectivity. Customarily, a human person is considered to be the one, however, this idea seems fundamentally wrong as people were far from being the first to begin to inhabit and use it, or from constituting the majority population on its surface. For this reason, it would be microorganisms.

Natural resources themselves then have value in themselves and not only in their processing. Intellectual work also has a vital role in this – not the physical one, but the mental one, according to whose program nature is transformed. “If left to market regulation alone, it will continue to kill wildlife unnoticed and will not cease to distort human nature” (Šmajs 2011b, 105).

2.3. All the living organisms have cognitive abilities

One of essential chapters of his work deals with learning about living organisms. In essence, in accordance with current scientific findings, Šmajs uses the term *reading* for three levels of cognition of reality. Although indirect but highly objective, the first

reading is biologically fundamental and written in the nucleic acid language. The second reading is well seen in multicellular animals with sensory-neutral behavioural regulation. It is partly a priori, set by the genome, and partly a posteriori, influenced by experience. The third reading is encoded in ethnic language. It is carried by man (Šmajs 2011b, 116–119).

He further argues that “man is, through culture, the only ontically creative animal, as a small god representing opposition to nature” (Šmajs 2011b, 120). However, man is “in the context of natural evolution, a strikingly deviating force” (Šmajs 2011b, 121).

3. The need for change

3.1 Ecological policy transformation

According to Šmajs, for a positive ecological transformation of the current anti-natural culture into a biophilic, natural culture, it is unnecessary – and even impossible – for us to change in advance. At the same time, however, it is not enough that only scientists, philosophers, and the environmentally sensitive public begin to understand the necessity of an ecological change. State and global politics (although real global politics does not yet exist) must develop a clear and citizen-understandable vision of possible long-term culture (Binka, Šmajs, and Timko 2011, 73).

Although biophilic culture will be created by succession, the ecological policy must openly subscribe to the biophilic paradigm; it must begin with publicly understood, supported, and controlled transformation in two areas simultaneously: in the relatively most straightforward sphere of naturalization of production, material culture, technology, and human settlements, in complicated areas of naturalization of human ontogenesis, education, training, law and people’s way of life. However, the environmental problem is global, affecting a socially and technologically structured world where there are considerable political contradictions and tensions (Binka, Šmajs, and Timko 2011, 73).

3.2. The problem of popularization of science

Because, as we have already mentioned, Šmajš sees one of the main reasons for the current crisis in science, philosophy, and politics, he introduces a possible strategy in the form of popularization of science. However, the right one is only the science that should succeed for the philosophy of survival. Such a science should be the social sciences, the sciences of culture. “Without their contribution, we will not only not understand science, but we will not be able to change the way of its theoretical focus and popularization” (Šmajš 2011b, 127).

A real planetary solution to the crisis, based for the first time on the absolute priority of the long-term habitability of the Earth, i.e., on a biophilic cultural strategy, must be prepared for the first time by a high theory. Therefore, a positive ecological transformation of existentially endangered culture through the change of its hidden spiritual basis, through its new constitutive information, represents a historically unprecedented attempt by philosophy and politics to end the phase of unnatural cultural evolution in general. It is about starting peaceful cooperation of culture with the Earth, about the timely cessation of the undeclared war of global culture with nature. The older, broader, and more powerful natural system would unnecessarily end the human species' existence prematurely (Binka, Šmajš, and Timko 2011, 74).

Elsewhere, Šmajš formulates seven problems of popularization of science and another seven new popularizations of science. He practically summarizes the book's content, “We need a philosophy of survival,” with the fact that he presents the popularization itself as a possible path.

It is only here that he says that although a bottom-up ecological change of culture is complex, its timely start is necessary (Šmajš 2011b, 137). It then offers as a solution its thesis of evolutionary ontology and its popularization – among other things in the form of education. He then defines the 11 points of the thesis of evolutionary ontological

minimum for teaching in schools (Šmajš 2011a, 224). Elsewhere, he describes 11 points of a very similar Evolutionary ontological minimum for economists (Šmajš, Binka, and Rolný 2012, 72). Furthermore, he describes the Biophilic orientation of education. He thus creates its system of education in schools, which it recommends for direct use. However, it is not possible to agree that such a process – curriculum regulation – is a bottom-up transformation.

It is time, Šmajš says, to show students and adults that natural reality is neither a set of objects here nor a clockwork of eternally moving atoms, molecules, planets, and galaxies. Nature, which has managed to create us and to whose structure we belong, is a gigantic evolutionary process; it is the largest and most complex ontically creative activity ever (Šmajš, Čílek, and Klíma 2010, 72).

3.3. Lease agreement with the Earth and Declaration of Dependence

While Librová brings the principle of voluntary frugality as a solution, Kohák and Keller present more general philosophical assumptions, Vavroušek is already working on a practical environmental policy. Šmajš, in turn, proposes a “Lease Agreement with the Earth” and a “Declaration of Dependence” with a more general philosophical basis for acknowledging the subjectivity of the Earth, evolutionary ontology, or predatory paradigm of culture with a proposal for a new biophilic policy with intersection “above” and “from below”.

As a summary of his entire work, Šmajš adds a draft of the so-called Lease Agreement with the Earth. He refers to this throughout many of his books and rightly considers it ground-breaking and important. It is a kind of ecoethical summary of his life's work, where he says that: “nature will decide our species existence” (Šmajš 2008, 409).

The lease agreement with the Earth contains a preamble and seven points, which can be briefly summarized as follows: (Šmajš 2008, 409-411)

1. The Earth cannot belong to man as a species that creates culture. We are temporary tenants of the Earth.
2. Life is a great experiment of cosmic evolution on our planet, and there is a fantastic amount of natural information written in organisms that is lost through culture.
3. Culture is the planetary creation of man as a species.
4. The conflict of culture with nature causes the loss of the Earth's natural environment; it cannot destroy nature, but culture, and thus destroy our possibility of survival.
5. Globalized culture also devalues the traditional structure and content of school education, which it criticizes.
6. Technological progress, which has long been synonymous with human ascension, is becoming its threat.
7. For the first time, man is held responsible for his species' existence. Understanding presupposes an evolutionary ontological view of the world. In a broken biosphere, man will not be a nature-protected species.

Thus, Šmajs appeals to the intellectual public, philosophers, politicians, lawyers, and all responsible citizens to conclude a treaty with the Earth in the interest of the very survival of humanity (Šmajs 2008, 409–411).

In later texts, together with other Czech authors, he presents a similar summary, but even more strictly, precisely in the spirit of his teachings on the subjectivity of the Earth and the predatory paradigm of culture. In the 11 provisions of the Declaration of Dependence he “calls on the public to re-understand the relationship between nature and culture and be careful about the broader and more distant consequences of expanding human work. Although anti-natural culture brings previously unknown prosperity to the technically advanced part of humanity, it does not eliminate poverty, war, violence, and inequality. As a whole, it acts as the most powerful destructive force on Earth. The more we work

together globally today, the more we hurt nature. Because culture destroys what we have not created, it can destroy everything we create. Today's culture can only be adapted to the Earth and human biological nature by approaching it as an artificial non-biological structure with inadequate internal information. Therefore, the biophilic rebuilding of culture awaits us as a challenge for all the responsible people of the planet: for scientists, politicians, and ordinary citizens ... If we want to survive on Earth, we must give way to nature wisely in time. The epoch of the symbiosis of culture and nature still lies ahead of us” (Šmajs, Binka, and Rolný 2012, 179–181).

Surely, one can agree with Šmajs when he says, “With every breath, with every sip of water, with every bite, we depend on a healthy, uninfested Earth” (Šmajs, Binka, and Rolný 2012, 179–181). In order to maintain the Earth's biodiversity, it is necessary to treat it ethically and give it a legal personality.

Šmajs's conception of culture is groundbreaking precisely in the paradigm of culture as predatory, exploiting the planet Earth, which recognizes its subjectivity. He thus sees culture as a negative human creation. After all, the retreat from culture in favour of nature is a trend that has already been realized today, among others in the Green Deal proposed by the European Union. Šmajss concept was thus, to a large extent, almost prophetic.

4. A new biophilic policy

Šmajs calls the new, necessary policy “biophilic” and says of its necessity and success: “The new biophilic policy needs broad public support. So, the part of the available cultural information that can bring about the relevant sociocultural change must meet two different requirements at the same time:

1. At a generally acceptable level, it must affect the general public, the individual.
2. At the high professional level, it must intervene in the sphere of power – national, regional, and global politics.

In other words: Because culture is a system with its internal information (general even unique, individual), new sociocultural information is not enough only in the original theoretical form, i.e., abstract theoretical knowledge of philosophers, differentiated knowledge, feelings, and attitudes of experts are not enough. A one-tier academic vision of the world is not enough. If the objectively necessary process of positive ecological transformation of culture is to take place, the two above-mentioned practically applicable layers must be established in the newly emerging ecological consciousness" (Šmajš and Krob 2003, 238).

However, it is up to everyone to decide how specifically they want to contribute to averting the threats that development has prepared for us (Keller 1995, 158).

The very practice of environmental protection provides evidence of the rejection of the possibility of radicalization of Šmajš's work. This is generally based on both proposed points. We can therefore state (together with Librová's descriptions, the personal approach of the individual – whether colourful, green, or simply ecological education at school or family or fashion, a trend to which the second way contributes in the form of elites, but also the influence of transnational or international organizations through which ecological ideas can be better enforced) that the necessary development described is already occurring naturally. Šmajš's philosophy is, therefore, a real way to preserve life on Earth.

Let us recall, however, as evidence, for example, the shift and difference that took place in society in the 1980s and 1990s, as evidenced by Librová's publications (*Varieties and Greens X Lukewarms and Hesitants*), while ecology in the 1980s concerned individuals and their voluntary approach, in the 1990s, it became a fashion promoted by social elites (Librová 2003, 271).

In addition, the connection of contemporary Czech thinkers with organized groups, which, however, remain in the limited form of Vavroušek's islands (Vavroušek 1990,

81), about which it can be assumed that in the future they will not expand into the majority population, but rather only increase the number of individual groups locally, which is also indicated by their trend towards decentralization, which again does not have an extremist effect. Even the very danger of radicalization can be rejected based on Binka's research (Binka 2008, 220). "Fortunately, both the number of realistic ecologists and the number and importance of economists who can listen to the ecology-mediated message carefully and without prejudice seem to be growing," says Keller (1995, 73).

In his books, Šmajš emphasizes the need for using education and its new reformed, pro-environmental, and at the same time interdisciplinary form, as the main step leading to the preservation of nature, which is not understood as an ideology, but a simple necessity of life. It can bring satisfaction and a promise of further development leading from sustainable development to sustainable living on the example of the Policy Priorities of the Ministry of the Environment of 2008 from 2008, which on the one hand, are somewhat minimalistic, but on the other support voluntary tools and approaches that are the basis of effective ecology and environmental protection. Another positive aspect is that, despite the change of governments and ministers (when the latter preferred the priority in the form of Farmers' Markets), the original priorities of supporting volunteering have been maintained.

Conclusion

This work deals with the life work, ethics, and philosophy of Professor Josef Šmajš. It was divided into three parts. The first part has introduced the basic ideas of his work. The second part has discussed the practical issues of the need for change. The third part has provided an comparison of Šmajš' work with other authors.

Through evolutionary ontology, Šmajš characterizes his philosophy as an ontology

that is civically and socioculturally engaged (Šmajš and Krob 2003, 349). From his perspective, he describes the bleak state of contemporary society as a “culture of needs”, which results in a global ecological crisis. He says that the world is ruled by a predatory paradigm of culture that directly causes the devastation and exploitation of the Earth. Šmajš talks about the opposite trends of natural evolution and cultural evolution and their mutual conditionality when the cultural one is based on the natural one.

Furthermore, Šmajš acknowledges the Earth’s legal personality, and at the same time denies work its added value. He argues that “nature has the highest possible value in itself, and human labour, on the contrary, reduces this unconditional value and turns it into cultural values only temporary and instrumental” (Šmajš 2011b, 87). As part of his proposed need to change the direction of biophilic ethics, together and according to the recognition of subjectivity to the Earth, he translates 11 points of the Evolutionary Ontological Minimum for teaching in schools and proposes to conclude a Lease Agreement with the Earth. It is a seven-point text that largely summarizes his teachings. In later texts and lectures, Šmajš presents another proposal, already developed in cooperation with many colleagues. It is a Declaration of Addiction, a text of 11 points, which again defines man’s relationship with nature in the form in which every person should internally identify with.

Prof. Šmajš represents one of the peaks of Czech “green” philosophy and ethics, among other things, precisely because of the emphasis on today’s newly applied interdisciplinary studies. He thus deserves to be granted a place in Czech philosophy, ethics and literature, and world philosophy and literature.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, J.L. and J.D.; Methodology, J.L.; Validation, L.R., P.O., Z.V. and J.D.; Writing – Original Draft Preparation, J.L.; Writing – Review & Editing, J.L., L.R., and P.O.; Supervision, J.D., L.R., P.O. and

Z.V. All 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

- Binka, Bohuslav, Josef Šmajš, and Marek Timko. 2011. *Tři studie z environmentální filosofie*. [Three studies in environmental philosophy]. Brno: Masarykova univerzita.
- Binka, Bohuslav. 2008. *Zelený extremismus. Ideje a mentalita českých environmentálních hnutí*. [Ideas and mentality of Czech environmental movements]. Brno: Masarykova univerzita.
- Databazeknih.cz. 2022. *Josef Šmajš, životopis*. [Josef Šmajš, curriculum vitae]. Accessed 7 Apr, 2022. <http://www.databazeknih.cz/zivotopis/josef-smajs-8670>.
- Keller, Jan. 1995. *Přemýšlení s Josefem Vavrouškem*. [Thinking with Josef Vavroušek]. Praha: Karolinum.
- Librová, Hana. 2003. *Vlažní a váhaví. Kapitoly o ekologickém luxusu*. [Lukewarm and hesitant. Chapters on ecological luxury]. Brno: Doplněk.
- Šmajš, Josef. 1997. *Konflikt přirozené a kulturní evoluce*. [Conflict of natural and cultural evolution]. Brno: Masarykova univerzita.
- Šmajš, Josef. 2003. *Filosofie psaná kurzívou. Rozhlasové ekologické eseje*. [Philosophy written in italics. Radio ecological essays]. Brno: Doplněk.
- Šmajš, Josef. 2008. *Filosofie – obrat k Zemi: evolučně ontologická reflexe přírody, kultury, techniky a lidského poznání*. [Philosophy – turn to Earth: evolutionary ontological reflection of nature, culture, technology and human knowledge]. Praha: Academia.
- Šmajš, Josef. 2011a. *Ohrožená kultura – od evoluční ontologie k ekologické politice*. [Endangered Culture – From evolutionary ontology to environmental policy]. Brno: Host.
- Šmajš, Josef. 2011b. *Potřebujeme filosofii přežití – Úvahy o přírodě, kultuře, ekonomice, práci, poznání a popularizaci vědy*. [We need a philosophy of survival – Reflections on nature, culture, economics, work, knowledge and popularization of science]. Brno: Doplněk.

- Šmajš, Josef, and Josef Krob. 1994. *Úvod do ontologie*. [Introduction to ontology]. Brno: Masarykova univerzita.
- Šmajš, Josef, and Josef Krob. 2003. *Evoluční ontologie*. [Evolutionary ontology]. Brno: Masarykova univerzita.
- Šmajš, Josef, Bohuslav Binka, and Ivo Rolný. 2012. *Etika, ekonomika, příroda*. [Ethics, economics, nature]. Praha: Grada.
- Šmajš, Josef, Václav Cílek, and Ivan Klíma. 2010. *Tři hlasy. Úvahy o povaze konfliktu kultury s přírodou*. [Three votes. Reflections on the nature of the conflict between culture and nature]. Brno: Doplněk.
- Vavroušek, Josef. 1990. *Životní prostředí a sebeřízení společnosti*. [Environment and self-management of society]. Praha: Institut řízení.