

## GREENING THE KNOWLEDGE ECONOMY- ECOSOPHY

**Gabriela Cornelia PICIU, Senior Researcher, PhD,  
Centre for Financial and Monetary Research “Victor Slăvescu”**

*Abstract: The perpetuation and deepening of the gap between the magnitude of natural events and insufficient human reaction inevitably lead to reaching the critical moment, catastrophic for human civilization. However, this implies a rethinking of the approach and action regarding the environmental challenges. A possible answer may be the formulation of a new theory on the relationship of man with the environment, which will make the transition from the concept of ecology, related to the middle of the XXI century, respectively the modern period, the industrial revolution, to another specific to the postmodern era.*

*Key words: new economy, rethinking the issue of value, transforming values into price, plus value, the value of exchange with other valorization systems*

### INTRODUCTION

Governments and institutions seem incapable of understanding environmental issues, of the environment, in all its implications, and even if there is a partial understanding of the most visible dangers that threaten the natural environment of man and societies, it boils down to the general approach to industrial damage, and only from the technocratic perspective, while the only ethical-political, ecocentric articulation called ecosophy, between the three ecological dimensions - of the environment, of social relations and of human subjectivity - could make explicit and clarify, Correspondingly, this issue, from the perspective of a deep ecology.

It is also clear that in countries where the proliferation of nuclear power plants poses imminent risks to a good life for mankind, the almost delusional nature of millions of nuclear developments can lead to the slightest technical or human failure, to an extermination. Chernobyl, and more recently, Fukushima being serious warnings, given the existence of hundreds of nuclear power plants carrying such risks.

### THE CONCEPT OF ECOSOPHY

Ecosophy is a concept invented by the philosopher Arne Næss, University of Oslo in 1960, this being the beginning of the ecological movement called deep ecology, which requires a reversal of the anthropocentric perspective: man is not at the top of the hierarchy of life, but it falls into the ecosphere, as a part that fits the whole.

The French philosopher and psychoanalyst Felix Guattari developed the concept of ecosophy in his book *The Three Ecologies*, in which he distinguishes: environmental ecology, on the relationships between nature and the environment; social ecology, regarding the relations between people and communities, economic and social realities; mental ecology, regarding the psychic relations, generating human subjectivities.

Etymologically, derived from the Greek language, ecosophy can signify the wisdom of living, of man in his own environment. Ecosophy offers a pragmatic perspective on social practices, paying attention, beyond the contemporary individual, often useless, to the formation of communities, beginning to reintegrate the complexity of individuals, their dreams, into the political equation.

In a certain ecosophical perspective, individual initiatives can be captured and communicated by groups of subjects or groups of leaders, who interpret diffuse needs and aspirations outside power institutions, make proposals for governments, put pressure on international bodies, and who act on the spirit, cultures and values of the rulers, elected or officials of international bodies.

Social ecosophy consists in the development of specific practices that will modify and reinvent the ways of being within couples, family, urban context, work, etc., by reconstructing the set of ways of being as a group, not only through interventions "communicative", but through existential mutations, leading to the essence of subjectivity, effectively experiencing both at the microsocial level and at the institutional levels.

In the ecosophical approach of the human relationship with the environment, attention must be paid both to the limited character of the space, the existence, and to the productive character of the human activity within the environment. The approach to this relationship can be done in a catastrophic way, if people are only offered the way to reterritorialize that same space or in a creative way, if people build a different territory, but they do not deny, it does not affect the initial space, because, the phase of complete denial of a natural space, in fact means its reterritorialization.

Reterritorialization, in an ecosophical perspective, means the process of reconfiguration, through cultural products, of human artifacts, of a natural territory, without taking into account the environmental characteristics and requirements.

### **SOME CONSIDERATIONS ABOUT ECOSOPHY**

The acceptance of the ecological perspective as a solution for overcoming the impasse created so far between man and the environment implies the construction of a new humanism, which cannot be other than the current ecologicalism, and this is due to the fact that sustainable solutions of socio-human becoming natural things can be found only by man and for human civilization, far from that "hatred of its own" present in some fundamentalist despairs, rather desperate, called by alarm than rational evaluations. A true "ecoumanism", which implies, among other things, a profound reform at the level of the mind, regarding the perception and valorization of the relations between man and the environment and of the fashion models. approach to related issues. Such a reaction is concentrated in the form of a response expressed under the concept of ecosophy.

Psychological research has shown that man's apathy to ecological threats can be explained by the inadequacy of our brain, which evolves in a way that allows it to react only to hazards that have precise characteristics, such as which we find, for example, in

terrorism, but not in climate change, the most probable and, perhaps, the most destructive catastrophe for human civilization, these characteristics being:

- man has a highly qualified brain to think about what others will do, understanding what others are capable of doing is so important to the survival of the species that it has developed a real obsession with what is human; this is how natural accidents scare us and worry us much less than a simple intentional act, which catches our attention and triggers our own self-defense mechanisms;

- ecoclimatic changes, for example, do not trigger the alert in the human brain, this being explained by the fact that it does not address our moral sensitivity, moral emotions being a call to a cerebral response; this moral neutrality of environmental challenges makes them less perceived and expressed by human sensitivity;

- if the signals are global, the warnings do not alarm us, it is also because we see in them a threat for the distant future, and not for tomorrow, the human brain remaining a sophisticated "immediate reaction" machine, which scrutinizes constantly his environment in search of what would be his target, in order to avoid the impact;

- Our brain is extremely sensitive to sudden changes in the environment, such as light, sound volume, temperature, pressure, etc. ; if the change is made with a certain slowness, it will go unnoticed; a progressive manifestation, such as that of ecological phenomena, does not generate prompt psychological reactions on the measure, the phenomenon of mental reaction still remaining too slow to make us reaction.

Complementary to the mental obstacle, there is also the current impasse of the adaptability of human society to the pace and scale of environmental change. Human civilization has been able to develop and assert itself in all its splendor, which we know today, and because it has benefited, for example, in the last 10,000 years from an exceptional ecoclimatic stability, which has allowed it, on the other hand, on the one hand, an easy and complete adaptation, and on the other hand, it favored and potentiated a massive transformation, which has recently become unbearable, of the natural environment reached at the moment of breaking the fundamental ecological balance. Thanks to its culture, man, unlike other species, overcame various ecological cleavages and adapted to all biotopes.

It must be borne in mind that mankind has known in its existence so far and experienced only periods of great cooling (with relatively sharp drops in temperatures up to 4-5 ° C), but never warming. global temperatures did not exceed 1-2 ° C averages, while the increases for the next hundred years rise (according to the considered climate models) to 8 ° C!

The average trend could be, at best, 4-5 ° C, ie the equivalent of a variation from an ice age and an interglacial era, but in the sense of warming, with 5-6 ° C more, in the European area. The planetary consequences revealed by specialists can be catastrophic; referring exclusively to the amplification of the violence of meteorological phenomena, in the conditions of the temperature increase by only 0.6 ° C, after 1970, the energy of the cyclones tripled, and the afferent damages increased five times. The pace of change has also accelerated, so that what has happened in millions of years is now happening on the scale of a century!

Large migrations would be one of the first social effects, but, far from being a solution in search of adaptation, it would lead to the amplification of the negative consequences of climate change. In this regard, it has been shown that in the coming decades ecoclimatic migrants could exceed 200 million, with major implications for international relations. Finally, the difficulties of adaptation must take into account that, throughout the history of the species, the human body has not changed much, today's man largely retaining his Neolithic biology, which diminishes the resistance to change.

On another level of analysis, the need for an ecosophy results from the obvious inefficiency of the practical action of nature conservation, prevention and reduction of pollution and protection of the environment. Thus, political ecology has reached an important point of development today, but still its effectiveness remains very low. Although ecology has entered the public debate and political dispute en masse, the deficit of action remains major. This inability of political action can highlight the fact that the means of achieving environmental goals does not lie today in the deceptive "economic democracy", but rather in the ways of life and cultural aspirations.

If ecological thinking has so far captured and exploited the importance of negative or positive "externalities", mineral or human resources for a "limited economy" (restricted), it is not impossible that, today, the determination to be stronger on the side of subjective externalities, that is, that of mentalities.

Economic values, like any other values, depend in their imposition and observance, on the credit granted to them, as can be seen from the phenomena of "euphoria" or stock market "panic". On the other hand, the movement of capital itself depends more and more on immaterial productions, so to speak, on the knowledge, desires and beliefs which it strives to capture. for his benefit. The "new economy" is in part a recovery of the voluntary energies invested in the development of the Internet, transforming "values" into price, plus value, etc.

The conclusion that can be deduced in this context is clear: there are permanent and dynamic faults between the physical, economic, but also the affective and mental environment and which show that the material infrastructure cannot be separated without risks of inefficiency. ideological superstructure. Thus, the most pressing practical issue for environmental policy would be that of values, affections and ways of life, according to the axiom that a wider economy presupposes, in a co-responsible way, a broader policy and ecology.

By definition, global problems, such as ecoclimatic problems, generated by the common but different contribution of all individuals, states and peoples, presuppose their solution and participation differently. tia, in a new solidarity and with the consciousness of a superior afferent responsibility.

Mankind is, as a whole, responsible for our mutual security, no nation being able to ensure its own security by seeking to establish its supremacy over others over threats such as nuclear proliferation, climate change, global pandemics. or terrorist groups. It also includes a responsibility to future generations: to preserve the resources that belong to them as well as to us. Every day when nothing is done or too little to prevent climate change is reflected in higher and higher costs for our descendants.

At the same time, societies and civilization evolve in a space of risks, which calls for redefining the responsibility of the individual, the state (via national solidarity) and the market (through private insurance), the issue of risk being a stake with socio-economic implications. ideological significance.

But in order to achieve global solidarity and a real and efficient ecological responsibility, an ecosophy expressed in individual and collective plan is needed.

### **ECOSOPHICAL APPROACHES**

The emergence of ecosophy, after the emergence of political ecology and the resurgence of environmental ideas, led to new philosophical questions, thus outlining an ecology of the spirit, a cognitive ecology, through the reflections and contribution of thinkers such as: Hans Jonas, G. Bateson, A. Petitjean, Edgar Morin.

The main problem of man becomes the way of living on this planet, in the context of the acceleration of technical-scientific mutations and the considerable growth of the population. The productive forces, in the conditions of the continuous development of the mass work, the multiplication by the computer revolution, make available an ever greater quantity of the time of potential human activity. But for what purpose? That of unemployment, of oppressive marginality, loneliness, anxiety, neurosis or, on the contrary, that of culture, creation, research, reinvention of the environment, enrichment of ways of life and sensitivity?

As a result, there can be no real response to the ecological crisis except at the global level and provided that a real political, social and cultural revolution takes place that reorients the objectives of the production of material and intangible goods. This revolution should therefore not only look at the power relations visible at a high level, but also at the molecular fields of sensitivity, intelligence and desire.

What would be the way and the means by which contemporary man could get out of his fatalistic anesthesia, out of his hyperadaptive integration?

In this sense, there is a need for new collective coagulations of expression, for new polyphonic interweavings between the individual and society; a new productivity of subjectivities must be sustained by concrete devices, new territories of existence producing a universe of values, whose sketches are traceable in our societies in "subject-groups".

Achieving a conceptual junction between all dimensions of current ecological approaches, leads to the idea of ecosophy, by articulating the three ecological approaches: environmental (for relations with the environment), social (for relations with "socius", economic and social realities) and mental (for reports on the psyche, the problem of the production of human subjectivity), around an "ecosophical object", which would go beyond the ecosystemic object and would be defined by four dimensions:

- that of flow, obvious, because within ecosystems there is, by definition, articulation of flows, often heterogeneous;
- that of the technological artifact, which is meant to give a dimension of cybernetic feedback, of ontological self-affirmation, without falling into the animist or vitalist myth;

- that of the ecosophical object, which is, at the same time, bearer of values, registers and perspectives of valorization, in this context being important for rethinking the issue of value, including economic value, and to articulate capitalist value, the value of exchange with other valorization systems: social systems, groups, individuals, individual, artistic, religious sensibilities, to articulate them with each other, without the economic value crushing them;

- that of existential finitude, called "essential territories", which is not considered an eternal entity, but is part of extrinsic, independent coordinates of determination.

In its system of values, the ecosophical object has a beginning and an end; he is in relation to a mechanical otherness, a branch, a technological, machinist typology.

From an ecosophical perspective, individual initiatives can be captured and integrated by subject groups or leader groups, which interpret diffuse needs or aspirations, outside power institutions, which translate them into government proposals, which put pressure on international courts, which acts on the spirits, cultures and values of statesmen, elected or officials of international bodies.

From this perspective, an ecosophy is a perspective including the ethical dimensions and articulating between them all ecologies: scientific, political, environmental, social and mental, this ecosophy can be called to replace the old ideologies that sectorized, in an abusive way, social, private and civilians and who were unable to establish junctions between politics, ethics and aesthetics. "

Neoliberal ideology justifies the sovereignty of the market through freedom of exchange, postulating the existence of an abstract market that governs and regulates all economic spheres. But such a "market" does not exist, on the contrary, there are all kinds of markets, such as: arms, owned by state powers, regional and local markets, but also parallel markets - drugs, mafia and even art; at the micro-social level there are domestic markets, those of barter in underdeveloped countries. The game between markets becomes a game between these power markets. Some are underestimated, others overestimated. So there is no single, transcendent category of the world market. There are valorization systems set up as existential territories - by a certain number of power-joining formations.

The three ecological approaches: environmental, political and mental are not in opposition, but, on the contrary, in a state of complementarity and mutual potential. Any approach to an environmental problem involves the development of a universe of values and, through this, an ethical-political commitment; At the same time, there is a need for the functioning of a modeling system to support it, the system, ie social practices, field, analytical practices when pursuing the production of subjectivity. It is by no means a question of systems of totalizing values, the great danger would be to substitute the myth of the working classes, bearers of the future of values, on that of an environmental protection, of a rescue of the biosphere that can acquire a totalitarian character. .

Promoting a philosophy of living, ecosophy also has an immanent political capacity. Creation is the sign of the living, so ecosophy is constructivist rather than conservative. It is not about defending the being, but about producing viable and living environments.

The ecosophical perspective implies, in terms of practical action, overcoming the traditional positions characterized by movements, parties or associations and finding a new form that allows overlapping, establishing a polyphonic relationship between different pragmatic objectives.

Without totally rejecting a "political armor", including with media leaders and "green" ministers, its existence and functioning are conditioned by the assurance not only of some forms and phenomena of control by the "base", but also of subjectivation phenomena, even if it can take a relative position. That is, the political leader to be an emotional, imaginary one.

The ecosophical project is desired and thus manages to assert itself simultaneously and coherently on a scientific, philosophical, chemical and political, ethical-aesthetic level.

### **ECOSOPHICAL DEVELOPMENTS**

After 1989, in particular, the resumption of the ecosophical issue took place, when the excesses of the victorious global neoliberal globalization were to enter into an open confrontation, on the one hand, with the alter-globalist movement, to which political ecology was almost naturally affiliated. on the other hand, with the reality of global ecological challenges, such as global warming and climate change and their theoretical resonances, the new data of reality marked remarkably the content and vigor of the initial theoretical discourse.

Pluralist ecology, both social and mental, as well as environmental, is now at a crossroads, perhaps the time has come to place ecosophy at the forefront of public debate and the beginning of a new beginning.

Maintaining itself and even asserting itself in a more protestant register, ecosophy can be part of the levers for achieving the theoretical foundations of another globalization (world) more solidary, more equitable and ecological. Ecosophy thus develops in the conditions of denouncing the current dominant model of development (and defining capital as a capture device) in the form of environmental thinking. As a wisdom of the environment, ecosophy involves, taking note of the ecological disaster and acting to regain a degree of creative autonomy, to rebuild another way of approaching, understanding and especially solving ecological problems. And this within the, fatally limited, beginning of shaping an alternative, perhaps more viable, to the current world order.

The information revolution has generated new challenges for ecosophy as well, the technological and economic advantages generating additional possibilities to ensure a superior quality of life, a new art of living, working and interrelation. Challenging the classical market economy, by advancing the project of a pluralistic economy (with market and non-market), giving a central place to culture and knowledge, imposing concepts such as: common heritage of humanity (in a first phase, for areas such as: water, air, genome, knowledge) pave the way for a necessary integrated and operational "thinking of complexity".

Despite the relative silence of thinkers in recent decades, the ecosophical problem has returned to attention in recent years, especially by the force of circumstances and ecological developments, which require relaunching, adapting and adjusting to new circumstances of the concept and begin to objectify its meanings.

Globalization, exacerbation and blockage of fundamental problems such as: depletion of the ozone layer, impoverishment and deterioration of biodiversity or, especially, global warming under the impact of the greenhouse effect amplified by human activities and, consequently, climate change demand, to overcome The impasse and finding a viable solution, new "keys" to understanding and action, including in the theoretical-cognitive plane.

At least three goals are now vital, namely:

- the construction and affirmation of a new solidarity at the level of the human species, based on the full awareness of the common destiny, of the common filiation, starting from the same ancestors and in spite of the cultural diversity and the extraordinary individual particularities (related more chosen by the specificity of the natural and socio-economic environment of evolution) and the deep cerebral and affective identity, which should lead to the consolidation of the idea of a terrestrial homeland, diverse and multidimensional, mentally and emotionally modeled and possible operationally and effectively;

- a vision of a necessary "coevolution" at the level of the biosphere, as an expression of the unification and originality of life on planet Earth, and a viable plausible hypothesis for its continuation and development;

- the configuration and promotion of a compatible, sustainable and biunivocal cohabitation, especially in operational plan, between the human megahabitat and the planetary ecosystem, in the sense of a gradual integration at the level of the essences.

From this perspective, keeping its initial definition, ecosophy is called that, rethinking its priorities, adapting its theoretical arsenal and assuming new responsibilities accordingly, to become the theoretical support of transformations. involving the transition of humanity to the decisive phase of restoring the ecoclimatic order, having as essential stake the reformulation of human place in the equation of planetary existence, which involves new questions, unique answers, bold measures, resulting in a new conception of rapid adaptability. and major to radical environmental changes.

## CONCLUSIONS

The problem of hope and despair can be approached from the perspective of their sources, namely:

- The first source of hope was in the improbable, the probable being what a human spirit, in a given place, at a given time, having the best means of information, can imagine that it will after all, it's probably not inevitable. Often, in an uncertain environment, with unforeseen developments, the improbable becomes probable, and vice versa.

- The second source of hope comes from human possibilities that are not yet up to date, taking into account the generic man, who means the one who has in himself the capacity to generate and regenerate. These capacities tend to fall asleep, to be sclerosed in civilizations, the generating or regenerating capacity sometimes needing a burst, a burst to manifest, the generating and regenerating forces often manifesting in a dispersed and embryonic, failing to unfold. At the same time as the destructive forces are amplifying, they could develop in the global crisis we are experiencing. Thus, they show us that we must change our path, that we need a new beginning. We can make sense of Heidegger's words: "The origin is not behind us, but in front of us."

- The third source of hope comes from the possibilities of metamorphosis. The first great metamorphosis that took place on Earth is that of transforming a strictly physico-chemical organization into a living self-organization. This self-organization possesses qualities, non-existent possibilities at the level of strictly physical or chemical organizations, it being able to reproduce, repair, move, know. For millennia, humanity has been made up of small hunter-gatherer communities with no state organization, no agriculture, no cities, no laws, yet in some parts of the globe, these communities have come together in a dense state. New demographic and were unified and transformed into meta-societies, historical societies with agriculture, with states, with cities, which contributed to the development of great civilizations. Today, the planet can no longer face deadly problems or treat its vital problems.

Humanity is in the age of globalization, but it should be overcome in a "world society." We are in full development, but this should be overcome in the idea of a policy of civilization and a policy of humanity. We are in a state of chaos, a state of agony, but this word, "agony," means "the supreme struggle between the forces of death and those of life" and, paradoxically, what death can bring can bring new life. There is, therefore, the hope of a metamorphosis of our present societies into a world-type society.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Berry, Thomas. *The Great Work: Our Way into the Future*. New York: Bell Tower, 1999. *The Viable Human*. In *Deep Ecology for the 21st Century*, ed. by George Sessions, 8-19. Boston & London: Shambhala, 1995.
- Chile Unido Foundation. 2000. *Deep ecology: biocentrism v / s anthropocentrism*. Chile Unido Foundation, no. 33 (September 2000).
- Drengson, A. and Y. Inoue, eds. 1995. *The Deep Ecology Movement: An Introductory Anthology*. Berkeley: North Atlantic Publishers.
- Guattari, F. 2000. *The Three Ecologies*. Trans. Ian Pindar & Paul Sutton, London & New Brunswick, NJ: The Athlone Press.
- Gudynas, Eduardo. 2012. *The long journey of the rights of nature*. *America Magazine Latina on the Move*, year XXXVI, 479 (October (2012)): 7-9.
- Lovelock, James. *Gaia*. 2007. A new vision of life on earth. Barcelona: Orbis, 1985. *Revenge of the Earth. Why the Earth is rebelling and how can we still save mankind*. Barcelona: Planet, 2007.
- Naess, Arne. 1995. *Self-Realization. An Ecological Approach to Being in the World*. In *Deep Ecology for the 21st Century*, ed. by George Sessions, 224-239. Boston & London.
- Stutzin, Geoffrey. 1984. *An ecological imperative. Recognize the rights of nature*. *Environment and Development* I, 1 (1984): 97-114.