SIGNIFICANCE OF ECOLOGICAL EQUILIBRIUM: A PHILOSOPHICAL PERSPECTIVE FOR NATURE'S SUSTAINABILITY

NANDANA.RR

Field Research Assistant Indian Institute of Technology Delhi

ABSTRACT

Ecological harmony and equilibrium is an inevitable topic every sensible person should address for the sustainable co-existence of the present as well as future generations of every living being. This necessitates the urgency of inculcating ecological awareness among all children from a very young age. The love towards nature must be taken into account for the welfare of the planet. It is true that every civilized society teach their young minds about the ecological matters. The grave question, however, is whether they are being taught in the right manner. This paper argues that rather than letting our children being with nature we push them to a world away from nature. This anthropocentric attitude of our pedagogy is detrimental to the well-being of our planet. We need to teach our children that there are 'shallow' and 'deep' ecological approaches. Shallow ecological approaches are usually taken into account by the government or any legislature because it gives an anthropocentric view which ensures the benefit of humankind only. But this a weak ecological approach since it meets human needs at the expense of nonhuman life. This paper analyses how to identify and classify an ecological approach either as 'shallow' or 'deep', and how to resolve practical ecological issues from the perspective of the theoretical structure of Deep Ecology, an environmental school of thought, formulated by Arne Naess, a Norwegian philosopher in the late 1970s.

Keywords :-*Ecology, sustainability, shallow ecology, deep ecology, anthropocentrism, self-realization*

INTRODUCTION

Let us begin with the term eco-system and its relevance. When Ernest Haeckel coined the term ecology, it was said to be a study of relationship between organisms and environment. But, when we look at this ideology, we can see that, this definition is far way behind and the relationship between environment and organisms has become a major issue in the current world. Natural environment consisting of four inter linking systems of hydrosphere, atmosphere, lithosphere and biosphere. Since these systems are not static, any change in these interlinked systems can change the equilibrium of natural environmental. The change can be either natural or man induced changes, in both cases the result can be seen on the ecological system of a river basin. Human activities are already impairing the flow of ecosystem services on a large scale, as human societies derive many essential goods from natural ecosystem. Ecological sustainability is always a key factor for the existence of man.

A significant amount of philosophically interesting and important research on environmental and ecological issues has been conducted during the past few decades. Philosophers soon recognized that traditional theories and principles were inadequate to deal with new environmental challenges. In response, philosophers began to extend traditional concepts and principles, so that they might become environmentally relevant. The science of environmental studies are globally been discussed and it a topic of logical and analytical versions. But in case of philosophical questions and its understanding and solutions for a better ecological system is very important because philosophical environmentalists focus on man's actions and bringing them out of the shell of anthropocentrism and making them evaluate and analyse the importance of preservation of ecology for the betterment of mankind.

DISCUSSION

In order to fist understand the philosophical stand of environmental sustainability, we must discuss the philosopher-environmentalist Arne Neass , and his contributions into the world of ecological equilibrium. There are two important terms by Arne Naess through which one can analyse environment, that is, 'deep ecology' and 'shallow ecology'. Shallow ecology refers to the philosophical or political position that environmental preservation should only be practiced to the extent that it meets human interests. It is more like a powerful fight against pollution and resource depletion rather than as a change. Exponents of this philosophy believe in continuing our present lifestyle, but with specifically aimed at minimising the damage to the environment. Its is also considered as a weak ecological outlook, it may

include the use of vehicles that cause less pollution or air conditioners that do not else chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs). This branch of ecology primarily serves to maintain the lifestyle of those dwelling in developed countries. Deep ecology believes that humans should radically change their relationship with nature. It is more of a philosophical perspective towards nature, that us, using man's philosophical change through actions strive for a better ecological equilibrium. Its proponents reject shallow ecology for prioritizing humans above other forms of life, and subsequently preserving the environmentally destructive way of life in modern societies.

The fight against pollution and resource depletion is also a cause by shallow ecology. Exponents of this philosophy believe in continuing our present lifestyle, but with specific tweaks aimed at minimizing the damage to the environment. Shallow ecology rejects eco-centric perspective and biocentrism. Shallow ecologists claim that there is nothing necessarily wrong with the anthropocentric worldview. we need an outsource to prevent such measures which are solely relied in anthropocentric view. Nature is only valuable insofar as it serves human interests. This is sometimes known as instrumental value. From this perspective, climate change is bad because it will affect human interests. It is humans that will ultimately suffer if climate change is allowed to occur. Damage caused by climate change might, for example, mean that it is difficult to obtain natural resources. It might also be that humans would simply not like to live on a damaged planet. Shallow ecologists claim that there is nothing necessarily wrong with the anthropocentric worldview. Even if there was a way of protecting humans from the effects of climate change, shallow ecologists would still think it was a bad thing to splurge for the cause of Climate Change.

This is what must be changed in the coming years for a better living of both humans and also to ensure the ecological balance of the state. This shallow ecological perspective, brings the importance of deep ecological ground. Though, deep ecological perspective can be difficult to implement practically, since, there are many practical difficulties while executing deep ecological issues and administering it on a political as well as, ecological manner is not something that can be easily done. Besides advocating these lifestyle changes, deep ecological shifts the attention from pollution and conservation narratives to robust policy formulation and implementation. According to Næss, policy-making must be aided by the reorientation of technical skills and inventions in new directions that are ecologically responsible. Arne Næss recommends that ecologists should reject work that is supervised by authorities with limited ecological perspectives. As irreplaceable informants, ecologists should not submit to power which does not recognize critical ecological priority.

In order to recognize the complex richness of different lifeforms, deep ecology calls for a re-evaluation of the 'survival of the fittest' doctrine. Survival of the fittest should be understood through the human ability to cooperate and coexist with nature, as opposed to exploiting it. Deep ecology prioritizes "live in a state where you live and also let them live" attitude denying the anthropological aspect. In his writings on deep ecology, Næss argues that a narrow focus on pollution and conservation movements is counterproductive. He believes that when projects are only implemented to solve pollution. According to Næss, a solution to this can be found in decentralizing the decision-making process and strengthening local autonomy. Næss cautions humans against adopting a global approach to the environmental crisis. A holistic perspective to the crisis is one which acknowledges regional differences and the disparities between developed and underdeveloped nations.
Næss stresses that the political potential of the movement be realised, and that those in positions of power be held accountable. The responsibility of solving the climate crisis falls on policy-makers as much as it does on scientists and ecologists. The core theme of deep ecology is the claim that all living things have the same right to live and flourish. This means that the interests of other living beings have to be treated as seriously as the interests of humans. A rainforest, for example, can no longer be regarded as a valueless wood resource. Instead, it is a collection of living things, all of which have a right to live and flourish. Another aspect of deep ecology is the idea that we

should expand our idea of who we are so that it includes the natural world. This is known sometimes as the expanded self. If we harm nature then we are really harming ourselves. Deep ecology rejects anthropocentrism in favour of eco-centric view or biocentrism. This is because the damage caused to other life forms would adversely affect. From a deep ecological perspective, climate change is wrong because it will affect the well-being of billions of 'living being'. Even if we could provide a way of protecting humans from climate change, it would still be a bad thing because many other living beings would suffer. It considers that developed countries are more responsible for climate change. Hence, argues for a 'holistic perspective' to the crisis which acknowledges regional differences and the disparities between under and over-developed nations. Fundamental values of deep ecology are mainly, Inherent values, diversity, vital necessities, population control, human interference, quality of life, policy change and also obligation of one's actions. Diversity will depend on the richness of life forms contribute to the realisation of these values and are also values in themselves. Humans have no right to destroy the diversity to satiate their needs. Population control will create a huge change as to consumption for natured decreases thereby, can create sustainability. The present human interference with the non-human world is excessive, and the situation is rapidly worsening. Due to high human interference policies must be changes to reduce and correct it for betterment. The ideological change is mainly that of appreciating life quality rather than adhering to an increasingly higher standard of living.

CONCLUSION

Conservationism, sustainability, equilibrium of environment all comes at a cost. Every single action of man will affect the ecological balance and equilibrium. Philosophical perspective thereby, deep ecological perspective makes a man question on how much one can take ecology for granted. Humans are only a part of the nature. Humans can never see their need to be overthrow the general environmental balance. The only way to sustain nature's balance is to change the lifestyle of humans and make changes. There are many movements that take place in conservation, preservation and also in maintaining ecological balance for the world peace. Thereby, a mere concern for the providers is Conservation strategy will be more eagerly implemented by people who love what they are conserving, and who are convinced that what they love is intrinsically lovable. Such lovers will not want to hide their attitudes and values, but rather will increasingly give voice to them in public. They have a genuine ethics of conservation, not merely a tactically useful instrument for social and political ends. This ethical perspective will help the people to understand, evaluate and above all make a change in the act of preserving ecological equilibrium. We as a human being who lives with
the help of nature, who breath, eat and fulfil all our necessities with their help, will never be able to live a peaceful life if environment balance is perturbed. We as a whole, should create a change and preserve nature from being disturbed, and as for a whole to change, each part of the whole must take responsibility and it is most important self-realization, that deep ecology has to teach for sustaining ecological equilibrium.

Reference

Naess, A., & Næss, A. (1990, October 26). *Ecology, Community and Lifestyle*. Cambridge University Press. http://books.google.ie/books?id=egGtPctMg8UC&printsec=frontcover&dq=ecology+community+and+lifestyle&hl=&cd=1&source=gbs_api

Næss, A. (2016, July 7). *Ecology of Wisdom*. Penguin UK. http://books.google.ie/books?id=aNn2CwAAQBAJ&printsec=frontcover&dq=ecology+of+wisdeom&hl=&cd=1&source=gbs_api

Pepper, D. (2002, June 1). *Modern Environmentalism*. Routledge. http://books.google.ie/books?id=5feJAgAAQBAJ&printsec=frontcover&dq=modern+environmentalism&hl=&cd=1&source=gbs_api

Callicott, J. B., & Frodeman, R. (2009, January 1). *Encyclopedia of Environmental Ethics and Philosophy*. Macmillan Reference USA. http://books.google.ie/books?id=hh65NwAACAAJ&dq=encyclopedia+of+environmental+ethics+and+philosophy&hl=&cd=1&source=gbs_api

DesJardins, J. R. (2000, January 1). *Environmental Ethics*. Cengage Learning. http://books.google.ie/books?id=3zsSAQAAIAAJ&q=environmental+ethics+an+introduction+to+environmental+philosophy&dq=environmental+ethics+an+introduction+to+environmental+philosophy&hl=&cd=1&source=gbs_api

Sessions, G. (1995, January 24). *Deep Ecology for the Twenty-First Century*. Shambhala Publications. http://books.google.ie/books?id=h9HtAAAAMAAJ&q=deep+ecology+for+twenty+first+century&dq=deep+ecology+for+twenty+first+century&hl=&cd=1&source=gbs_api
Hay, P. R. (2002, January 1). *Main Currents in Western Environmental Thought*. Indiana University Press. http://books.google.ie/books?id=bzV1obaQ7fYC&printsec=frontcover&dq=main+currents+in+western+environmental+thought&hl=&cd=1&source=gbs_api
Hannay, A. (2009, May 21). Arne Naess (1912–2009). *Inquiry*, *52*(3), 306–307. https://doi.org/10.1080/00201740902917176
Wills, C. (2013, March 28). *Green Equilibrium*. Oxford University Press, USA. http://books.google.ie/books?id=Vf7TyICmsdgC&printsec=frontcover&dq=ecological+equilibrium&hl=&cd=4&source=gbs_api
Lemons, J., Westra, L., & Goodland, R. (2013, April 17). *Ecological Sustainability and Integrity: Concepts and Approaches*. Springer Science & Business Media. http://books.google.ie/books?id=c4DvCAAAQBAJ&printsec=frontcover&dq=ecological+sustainability&hl=&cd=1&source=gbs_api
Naess, A., & Næss, A. (1990, October 26). *Ecology, Community and Lifestyle*. Cambridge University Press. http://books.google.ie/books?id=egGtPctMg8UC&printsec=frontcover&dq=ecology+community+and+lifestyle&hl=&cd=1&source=gbs_api
Næss, A. (2016, July 7). *Ecology of Wisdom*. Penguin UK. http://books.google.ie/books?id=aNn2CwAAQBAJ&printsec=frontcover&dq=ecology+of+wisdeom&hl=&cd=1&source=gbs_api
Pepper, D. (2002, June 1). *Modern Environmentalism*. Routledge. http://books.google.ie/books?id=5feJAgAAQBAJ&printsec=frontcover&dq=modern+environmentalism&hl=&cd=1&source=gbs_api
Callicott, J. B., & Frodeman, R. (2009, January 1). *Encyclopedia of Environmental Ethics and Philosophy*. Macmillan Reference USA. http://books.google.ie/books?id=hh65NwAACAAJ&dq=encyclopedia+of+environmental+ethics+and+philosophy&hl=&cd=1&source=gbs_api
DesJardins, J. R. (2000, January 1). *Environmental Ethics*. Cengage Learning. http://books.google.ie/books?id=3zsSAQAAIAAJ&q=environmental+ethics+an+introduction+to+environmental+philosophy&dq=environmental+ethics+an+introduction+to+environmental+philosophy&hl=&cd=1&source=gbs_api
Sessions, G. (1995, January 24). *Deep Ecology for the Twenty-First Century*. Shambhala Publications. http://books.google.ie/books?id=h9HtAAAAMAAJ&q=deep+ecology+for+twenty+first+century&dq=deep+ecology+for+twenty+first+century&hl=&cd=1&source=gbs_api
Hay, P. R. (2002, January 1). *Main Currents in Western Environmental Thought*. Indiana University Press. http://books.google.ie/books?id=bzV1obaQ7fYC&printsec=frontcover&dq=main+currents+in+western+environmental+thought&hl=&cd=1&source=gbs_api
Hannay, A. (2009, May 21). Arne Naess (1912–2009). *Inquiry*, *52*(3), 306–307. https://doi.org/10.1080/00201740902917176
Wills, C. (2013, March 28). *Green Equilibrium*. Oxford University Press, USA. http://books.google.ie/books?id=Vf7TyICmsdgC&printsec=frontcover&dq=ecological+equilibrium&hl=&cd=4&source=gbs_api
Lemons, J., Westra, L., & Goodland, R. (2013, April 17). *Ecological Sustainability and Integrity: Concepts and Approaches*. Springer Science & Business Media. http://books.google.ie/books?id=c4DvCAAAQBAJ&printsec=frontcover&dq=ecological+sustainability&hl=&cd=1&source=gbs_api