



Environmental ethics based on Hans Jonas' principle of responsibility

**Andrés Felipe Sanmartín Sanmartín¹ Luis Fernando Garcés Giraldo²
Conrado de Jesús Giraldo Zuluaga³ Eduar Antonio Rodríguez Flores⁴**

Abstract

The principle of responsibility presented by Hans Jonas is a proposal that seeks to raise awareness about the way in which a technological era has been consolidated, which threatens the natural order as we know it today and which is contextualized in the use and abuse that directly impact natural resources. but also that they generate difficulties for the human being himself, which affect his health and, therefore, the quality of life in conditions of dignity for all, since life on the planet is alternating thanks to the boom in technical and scientific development in modernity. In this sense, the proposal that allows this social situation to be solved is oriented towards the apprehension of the principle of responsibility through which scientific and human work can be accompanied and with which human beings can have a better awareness of their freedom in order to consider the long-term consequences that actions may have and that serve as an essential element to ensure permanence on earth and the flourishing of the human and the vindication with the planet regarding the importance of leaving it in habitable conditions for future generations. Finally, adjusted to a qualitative approach, it seeks to understand the fundamental elements of this proposal such as the new categorical imperative and the principle of responsibility, adjusting these ideas to a view that allows updating this proposal with the importance of an environmental ethics based on the idea of Aristotelian virtue and the ideal of Spoudaios that is required for the experience of it.

¹Research professor attached to the Faculty of Law and Forensic Sciences of the Technological University Institution of Antioquia (Medellín, Colombia). PhD student in Philosophy at the Universidad Pontificia Bolivariana (Medellín, Colombia). E-mail: abogadoasanmartin@gmail.com; ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3243-8360>

²Directorate of Research and Innovation; Autonomous University of Peru; Lima (Peru). E-mail: garcsgir@autonoma.edu.pe; ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3286-8704> (correspondence author).

³Professor and Researcher at the Faculty of Philosophy and Academic Coordinator of Postgraduate Studies in Philosophy at the Universidad Pontificia Bolivariana (Medellín, Colombia). E-mail: conrado.giraldo@upb.edu.co; ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1885-9158>

⁴Directorate of Research and Innovation, Universidad Autónoma del Perú, eduar.rodriguez@autonoma.pe, ORCID: 0000-0003-0807-6686.

*Corresponding author

DOI: 10.70102/IJARES/V6IS1/6-2-05

Keywords: technological civilization, ethics, environment, responsibility, *spoudaios* and virtue.

Introduction

Currently, the issue of environmental care is being discussed with great intensity in different contexts of the Colombian reality such as legal, political, philosophical, economic, among others, however, this is not an issue that only concerns Colombia but also occupies the attention of great scholars and experts in different latitudes. since although there was an unfinished conception of the environment and its resources with respect to an anthropocentric vision, the truth is that human beings have been noticing how the same human intervention contextualized as "abuse" and "lack of care", can actually endanger existence as we know it.

From this perspective, the doctrinaire Hans Jonas, in his book "The Principle of Responsibility", presents an alternative to what he himself has called "techno-scientific development", which with the multiple alternatives of production has not only changed the way of being and thinking of people, but has also permeated the action itself to the point of configuring a "modus operandi" far from ethical aspects related to reflection. awareness, care and respect for the other. As a result of this transformation, the world has been changing and with it the human being has modified his behavior, being very significant for many people to sustain their existence more on having than on *being*.

For this reason, the purpose of this review, which is oriented towards the revision of the ethical assumptions proposed by Jonas, is to study the new categorical imperative proposed by the author, going through an exercise that allows a review of the ethical foundations that sustain the principle of responsibility. Once these aspects have been reviewed, we will seek to adjust these proposals to the ideal of *Spoudaios* and the ethical virtues of Aristotle in order to update this proposal according to the need to experience an environmental ethics in Colombia.

Methodology

This exercise is ascribed to a methodological approach of a qualitative nature, which is why according to Hernández, Fernández and Baptista (2014) insist that this approach:

(...), provides depth to the data, dispersion, interpretive richness, contextualization of the environment or environment, details and unique experiences. It also provides a "fresh, natural and holistic" point of view of phenomena, as well as flexibility. (...). The ultimate scope of qualitative studies often consists of understanding a complex phenomenon. The emphasis is not on measuring the variables of the phenomenon, but on understanding it. (p. 18)

To develop the research proposal, the main ethical assumptions suggested by the doctrinal Hans Jonas in the text called "the principle of responsibility" will be addressed, which involve the study of the new categorical imperative, the heuristics of fear, the vulnerability of the human being and the principle of responsibility, adjusting these ideas to a view that allows updating this proposal with the importance of a well-founded environmental ethics. in the Aristotelian idea of virtue and the ideal of the *Spoudaios*

Finally, it should be mentioned that this review will be accompanied by the study and analysis of primary and secondary sources, with which the specialized literature on the subject will be reviewed and the respective hermeneutical contributions will be presented.

Methodological design used in the research

The methodological design that is intended to be implemented in the research process begins through the search and eventual review of the literature from secondary sources, through which the exploration of the main concepts that are related to the main topic of study can be configured. In this sense, a qualitative research approach is suggested that, through the hermeneutical method supported by Gadamer,¹ allows understanding the ideas of technological civilization, ethics, environment and responsibility.

¹ This hermeneutical method conforms to the so-called *hermeneutical circle*, necessary in this process of research as an element that allows us to understand history combined with real life, since, as Gadamer states: "Like real life, history interests us only when it refers to our previous judgment about things, men and times. Any understanding of something

However, the exercise involved in reviewing the literature is structured in the following steps:

A. Identification of the need for revision: the literature related to the principle of responsibility includes talking about the relationship between ethics and the environment, aspects that have been increasing the discussion from different contexts such as philosophy, law, economics, among others.

Next, bearing in mind that there are currently multiple doctrinal elements that help to contextualize and deepen this exercise, the recommendation presented by Petticrew and Roberts (2006) is accepted, through which "it is necessary to have the topic and the research questions clearly defined, to avoid the risk that the review becomes unmanageable". therefore, the structure of the search for information is presented based on the following questions:

- What contributions does Hans Jonas make in environmental ethics with his proposal of the principle of responsibility?
- What other ethical assumptions today can help to update Hans Jonas' ethical proposal?

B. Definition of bibliographic search strategies: the sources of information that supported this research were defined by incorporating primary sources such as the works of Hans Jonas and the works of Aristotle. Likewise, international sources of information indexed in Scopus were highlighted, among which are: Analytic Philosophy, Ancient Philosophy, Behavior and Philosophy, Boston Studies in the Philosophy and History of Science, British Journal for the Philosophy of Science, among others.

C. Evaluation and analysis of the selected sources of information: taking into account the selected secondary sources of information, the doctrinal contributions that are directly related to the questions defined in the initial phase were explored. In this way, the categories that were defined to divide the information were: *technological civilization, ethics, environment and responsibility, Spoudaios and virtue*. Finally, it should be mentioned that through the steps described above, it has been intended to comply with the structure of the thematic review and, therefore, both the questions and the categories presented serve as guidance for the presentation and argumentation of the results.

Frame of reference

This frame of reference is contextualized in two fundamental aspects of Jonas's proposal, namely: *the degree of current vulnerability of human beings* and the so-called *fear heuristic*.

The concept of "vulnerability" according to the author is framed in the risks faced by humanity with respect to a series of consequences that derive from the power of technology, a situation that is evidenced in the deterioration of the environment with respect to the indiscriminate abuse of natural resources, so it is essential to review the current interaction that exists between humanity, technology and nature. In this way, Jonas warns of the imminent need to redefine the assumptions of technical scientific progress, since mere optimism, and even the naïve perception that science solves and provides efficient solutions to all the problems that arise as part of life is not enough. In the words of Jonas (1995), it should be remembered that:

Nature was something lasting and permanent, certainly subject to cycles and changes, but capable of healing without difficulty the small wounds that man caused it with his tiny interventions. This has changed radically with the emergence of modern science and the technology that derives from it. Now man is in fact a threat to the continuation of life on earth. Not only can it end its existence, but it can also alter the essence of man and disfigure it through various manipulations. (p. 8)

From this perspective, it is recalled that through the rise of technical development, paradigms such as mass creation, planned obsolescence and, above all, the fashion of having for being's sake has been privileged, being

significant presupposes that we bring a set of such prejudices. Heidegger called this situation the hermeneutical circle: we understand only what we already know; we perceive only what we put in. This seems inadmissible if measured with the criterion of knowledge of the natural sciences; but only in this way is historical understanding possible. It is not a question, according to Heidegger, of avoiding this circle, but of using it correctly." (Gadamer, 1998, p. 40)

very relevant to understand the way in which our own way of living has been constituted as a way of altering nature and, therefore, of generating adverse consequences for our health and quality of life.

From this perspective, Jonas highlights the current vulnerability of human beings as a consequence that comes from the subjection of nature, with which he sought to generate conditions of comfort, tranquility, ease and "well-being", however, what turned out to be the solution to human needs, has today become his greatest concern and affectation. In this sense, the author highlights that:

The subjugation of nature, designed to bring happiness to mankind, has been so inordinately successful - a success which now affects human nature itself as well - that it has placed man before the greatest challenge that by his own action has ever been presented to him. All this is novel, different from the previous one both in genre and magnitude. (Jonas, 1995, p. 15)

Next, the vulnerability of the human being also implies the vulnerability of nature, so it is essential to rethink the way in which the concepts of "right" and "duties" are conceived, since although one has the right to enjoy a healthy environment, one should understand what are the duties that are deduced from this enjoyment. on the understanding that what is not cared for or protected cannot be requested as a right. Likewise, taking into account that nature itself and its resources serve as the sustenance of existence, it is the human being himself who is the first to transform his action in favor of the preservation of his own existence and that of future generations. In this order of ideas, according to Jonas's proposal, this reflection aimed at understanding and assuming the vulnerability of the human being, and therefore, the vulnerability of nature, must be adjusted to great tasks that involve questioning what could be a new imperative that allows us to guide human action, but also the importance of reviewing the responsibility of citizens and rulers in the face of the construction of the future. No less important, then, is the task of the human being with respect to the existential task of prolonging life and the exercise that involves controlling his conduct, all of them as important and necessary elements when it comes to identifying the relevance of the principle of responsibility within an ethical life that manages to combine knowledge, knowledge, awareness and duty in the concrete action of caring for and protecting the common home, or life and the environment in which it develops, always involving other living beings and natural resources.

In accordance with the above, it should be stated that through the proposal presented by Jonas, a second very relevant element is glimpsed, which is called "fear heuristic", and which is defined in the following terms: (...), only the foreseeable disfigurement of man helps us to reach that concept of man who must be preserved from such dangers. We only know *what* is at stake when we know *what* is at stake. Since what is involved here is not only man's fate, but also the concept we possess of him, not only physical survival, but also the integrity of his essence, ethics – which must guard both – must be, transcending the ethics of prudence, an ethics of respect. (Jonas, 1995, p. 16)

From this perspective, the fear heuristic is constituted as a form of rational fear, or as a reverential act that, by imagining the possible consequences that arise with the deterioration of the environment and its effects on life, allows human action to be oriented to more conscious and responsible exercises. In this way, the human capacity to foresee the effects of irresponsible human actions with respect to the preservation of human life as we know it derives from this proposal.

In this regard, Jonas (1995) states that:

Not the fear that discourages action, but the fear that encourages it, we refer to the fear that is an essential part of responsibility and that is a fear that fears for the object of responsibility. We have already shown before the fundamental vulnerability of that object, for which there may be something to fear, therefore. Which in this specific case moves someone to appropriate that as their own fear and to turn it into a duty of action (...). Responsibility is care, recognized as a duty, by another being, care that, given the threat of its vulnerability, becomes a concern. But fear is already as a potential in the original question with which all active responsibility can be initially represented; What will happen to that if I don't take care of it? The more obscure the answer, the clearer the responsibility; and the farther away in the future is that which is to be feared, the farther it is from one's own joys and sorrows, and the more uncertain it is, the more diligently must the clairvoyance of the phantasy and the sensibility of feeling be mobilized in its favor: an inquisitive heuristic of fear will be necessary, which will not only discover and reveal to it its new object, but even to become familiar with the particular moral interest that it claims. (p. 357)

This is what the heuristic of fear consists of, then, in preventing the risks that our actions can mean for ourselves, for the environment, for animals and all the natural resources that are related to our survival. In this way, it is not a matter of giving up what we want, it is about generating a greater awareness of responsibility that allows us to balance the will with the desire, in order to turn our own life into a way of cohabiting the world without representing a threat or a danger to everything and everyone.

Results

The proposal presented below is contextualized through the following assumptions, namely: *to study the new categorical imperative proposed by the author and to review the ethical foundations that sustain the principle of responsibility*. Once these aspects have been reviewed, we will seek to adjust these proposals to the ideal of Spudaios and the ethical virtues of Aristotle as a way of proposing the need for environmental ethics in Colombia.

Jonah's New Categorical Imperative

In Jonas's proposal, a new categorical imperative is glimpsed, with which a hermeneutical and propositional exercise is made with respect to the Kantian categorical imperative, which has a context oriented towards sustainability and always thinking of the future as a time frame.

In the words of Jonas (1995) it is recalled that:

Kant's categorical imperative said: "act in such a way that you can also will that your maxim should become a universal law." The "may" invoked here is that of reason and its concordance with itself. *Assuming* the existence of a society of human actors (rational acting beings), the action must be such that it can be thought of without self-contradiction as a universal practice of that community. Note that here the fundamental reflection of morality is not itself moral, but logical; "being able to will" or "not being able to will" expresses self-compatibility or logical self-incompatibility, moral non-approval or disapproval. (p. 39)

Consequently, it is important to mention that according to the author the Kantian imperative serves as a frame of reference and approximation to a desired and conscious action, however, in the margin of an action aimed at caring for the other and others, a greater concordance must be sought between desire, knowledge, consciousness and the purpose of the action. For this reason, this Kantian imperative must be adjusted not only to human needs but also to man's own actions, so a new imperative is proposed that, according to the postulates of the ethics of responsibility, would read as follows:

Act in such a way that the effects of your action are compatible with the permanence of an authentic human life on earth; or, expressed negatively: act in such a way that the effects of your action are not destructive to the future possibility of that life; or, simply: do not endanger the conditions of humanity's indefinite continuity on earth; or, formulated once again positively: include in your present choice, as also the object of your will, the future integrity of man. (Jonas, 1995. p. 40).

With this new imperative, it is possible to glimpse not only the importance of the knowledge that human beings must have when intervening in the environment - their environment - but also the existence of other aspects such as the will and awareness of the effects that their own action can generate in the future. Following this, it is essential to weigh the personal interests with which a community pursues, establishing precisely that any action away from responsibility generates consequences that can be adverse for everyone.

In this way, this imperative must serve to rethink and reevaluate - as already stated above - the concepts of right and duty, through which people have understood the importance of the effective satisfaction of those social guarantees, among which the enjoyment of the environment stands out, so that this imperative allows ethical reflection to be oriented more to the conscience of the duty of care than to the exercise of the claim for the effective enjoyment of the healthy environment by the State and society.

However, according to the author, this imperative must be constituted in a public policy that allows everyone to be reached, that is, it is constituted in a proposal that must be read as the principle of a universal mandate. Under this guidance, it must state that:

The new imperative appeals to another type of concordance; not to that of the act with itself, but to the concord of its ultimate effects with the continuity of human activity in the future. And the universalization that it contemplates is not hypothetical at all, that is, it is not the mere logical transfer of the individual "I" to an

imaginary "whole" and without any causal link with it. On the contrary, the actions subjected to the new imperative - actions of the collective Whole - have their universal reference in the real measure of their effectiveness; they "totalize" themselves in the progress of their impulse and can only lead to the configuration of the universal state of things. (Jonas, 1995, p. 41)

Finally, it must be agreed that this imperative proposed by Jonas seeks to serve as an orientation to the human being in his daily life, in order to make him aware that his actions must be ethical and, therefore, must be aimed at the maintenance of life on earth, at sustainability, at the survival of the current and future existence of humanity. In this way, it starts from an interior reality to the exterior, in other words, the Kantian presupposition of duty in Jonas is transfigured by the awareness that everything should imply doing and since every action generates consequences, it is the human being who must choose freely based on the ethics of responsibility.

The ethical foundations that underpin Jonas's principle of responsibility

According to Jonas, responsibility must go beyond a simple ethical concept, it must constitute a way of life capable of identifying the immediate and immediate effects of our actions. In this way, responsibility defines the person, and with it we can read not only the ethical capacity that a human being has to face life, but also the vision that the person has regarding the care of himself, others and the other.

Reviewing the concept of responsibility in Jonas implies understanding the existence of ethical foundations that sustain it. In fact, it must be accepted that this responsibility is an ontological task since it goes beyond a moral obligation, starting from the foundation according to which being and its existence constitute the fundamental value of life.

Likewise, it is identified that this responsibility is framed in the principle of sustainability, so it is a global responsibility incapable of showing that technology and current developments can alter human nature itself, and when it comes to the preservation of life on earth, human beings cannot be negligent in understanding the consequences that their actions can generate for everyone. In this sense, a paradigm shift is necessary, that is, it is urgent to overcome anthropocentrism by biocentrism, in order to overcome individual moral judgments, constituting in the very action of the human being a commitment to himself, to the other and to the other, since, although we understand that nature is vulnerable to human actions, therefore, humanity is vulnerable with respect to the changes that nature itself can generate. It is a matter of being aware of a mutual vulnerability in order to perfect the relationship of the human being with nature and everything in it.

Note that Jonas's proposal identifies a form of threat against the environment that constitutes a desecration of nature, a phenomenon that is accompanied by such selfishness that it allows the human being to achieve the necessary degree of awareness regarding his actions. There is a culture of "self-absorption" aimed at excessive accumulation, which gives a closer glimpse of the human inability to reflect on the satisfaction of needs, a situation that highlights not only human vulnerability to pollution and environmental deterioration, but also the degradation of the natural environment and its resources.

Therefore, the relationship between human beings and nature is causal (cause and effect) and the effects of environmental deterioration are reciprocal, that is, they affect the environment and its resources and with it life itself is threatened, so it is inferred that neglect of the conditions that imply the sustainability of the environment leads to consequences that end up affecting humanity and life on earth as we know it today day, which becomes an irreplaceable condition for future generations. In the words of Jonas (1995), it should be remembered that:

If the sphere of production has invaded the space of essential action, then morality will have to invade the sphere of production, from which it was previously kept away, and now to do so in the form of public policy. (p. 37).

According to the above, it must be agreed that one of the ethical foundations that sustain Jonas' principle of responsibility is constituted as "care", understood as a concern that implies the conscious and rational occupation of the human being that must drive him to conserve his natural environment, initially out of necessity, but also because it is necessary to flourish (an awakening) that involves survival as a key factor for understanding and intervention of reality, that is, it is a holistic, integral and integrated response, which in the words of Aristotle is identified with the ideal of the *Spoudaios* or of that dignified, virtuous person who seeks excellence through his daily actions. Indeed:

The presence of man in the world It was a first and unquestionable fact from which any idea of obligation in human behavior was based. Now that very presence has become the object of obligation: of the obligation to guarantee in the future the first premise of all obligation, that is, precisely the existence of candidates for a moral universe in the physical world. And this implies, among other things, preserving this physical world in such a way that the conditions for such existence remain intact, which means protecting it, in its vulnerability, against any threat that endangers those conditions. (Jonas, 1995, p. 38)

This contribution suggested by Jonas guides the reflection towards a second ethical foundation, which according to the author allows the introduction of the concept of "fear heuristic", with which not only a challenge to the traditional ethical conception is imposed, but also constitutes a way of guiding human action in order to prevent possible damage or catastrophes that in environmental matters may affect life. In the context of the responsible ethical proposal, this foundation consists of knowing, understanding and attending to our fears instead of giving priority to our appetites, desires or tastes.

This way of helping to regulate or make human action more conscious is oriented under the principle of decision-making, it also seeks the exercise of prudence, through which the need to "prophesy" or "foresee" aspects that may generate damage, deterioration or catastrophes in environmental matters is identified, rather than having to seek solutions to imminent problems or act with irresponsible optimism. Under this guidance, it is recalled that:

(...), only the foreseeable disfigurement of man helps us to reach that concept of man who must be preserved from such dangers. We only know what is at stake when we know what is at stake. Since what is involved here is not only man's fate, but also the concept we have of him, not only his physical survival, but also the integrity of his essence, ethics – which must guard both – must be, transcending the ethics of prudence, an ethics of respect. (Jonas, 1995, p. 16)

This contribution gives a glimpse of a final essential foundation of Jonas's proposal, which is constituted as responsibility. This, which is the starting point of the ethics proposed by the author, is also constituted as a vital exercise or practice of life, since, as said before, it is not a moral obligation, but must go further, it is an ontological requirement that challenges the being itself, the existence of the person and of humanity. Therefore, the principle of responsibility must promote awareness of actions (voluntary and involuntary) and their consequences, since irresponsibility is the reflection of ignorance or ignorance, this principle must be practical, that is, it must be permanent, continuous and fully aware of the execution of daily actions. In this regard, Jonas (1995) indicates that:

The demand to be begins with being. But the ethics we seek has to do precisely with what is not yet, and its principle of responsibility must be independent of any idea of a right as well as of the idea of reciprocity, so that in its framework the jocular invented question can never be asked: Has the future ever done anything for me? Does he respect my rights). (p. 83)

Consequently, to live implies being responsible for oneself, but at the same time one must take care of others and others in a responsible way, therefore, the exercise of responsibility is not defined as a moral practice or a mere choice, it must transcend to constitute itself as an ontological function of human existence. aware of the positive impact on life, as an inescapable and inherent element of the human being in relation to scientific and technological developments and currently tools such as artificial intelligence.

The above can be summarized in the following table, namely:

Table No. 1. Ethical foundations that underpin Jonas' principle of responsibility

ETHICAL FOUNDATIONS	BACKGROUND	FUNCTION AND INVOLVEMENT
<p>New Imperative categorical</p>	<p>It is a matter of seeking a concordance of "Act in such a way that you do not the human being not only with his own endanger the conditions of humanity's acts, but with the effects that these may indefinite continuity on earth"; or, "Act generate with respect to the continuity of in such a way that the effects of your life on Earth in conditions of dignity and action are not destructive to the future with a view to guaranteeing a sustainable possibility of an authentic human life and optimal future for all, including on Earth." (Jonas, 1995, p. 9)</p> <p>future generations.</p>	

a matter of preserving life in conditions of dignity, it must seek the promotion of a duty from which a way of life capable of experiencing responsibility as an act can emerge continuous and temporal that can be extended as a vital and historical example to future generations, under the paradigms of paternity and political leadership as ontological conditions of human existence.

Discussion and conclusions

This section is based on the idea that suggests the need for a responsible environmental ethics based on the ethical virtues of Aristotle, that is, on justice, continence, temperance, fortitude, courage, liberality, concord, benevolence, moderation, friendship, magnificence, magnanimity, meekness, kindness, sincerity and acuity.

A responsible environmental ethic based on the ethical virtues of Aristotle

Aristotle affirms that ethical virtue has to do with passions and actions, and also states that in them are found the excess, the defect and the middle ground (Aristotle, 2018, 1106b, p. 25). In this way, it must be understood that through these ethical virtues proposed by Aristotle, today it is necessary to have a responsible environmental ethical proposal, which allows justice to be combined as that action par excellence that allows practicing what is just in the polis (society), since this virtue includes the others.

Now, a way of acting with ethical responsibility implies assuming justice as an intentional action, capable of weighing and, above all, of deciding at all times what is convenient, since this Aristotelian justice that comes from *diké* corresponds to the ability to always give and discern what is right.

In addition to the above, a responsible environmental ethic reflects justice as a person's way of being, but at the same time it involves the ideal of *spoudaios*, as a way of life that tends to the best, the pleasant, the virtuous, that is, the right mean. In Aristotle's words, the just mean or middle ground is predicated as a point of reference that is far from both extremes (Aristotle, 2018, 1106b, p. 25).

In effect, justice as an action and virtue of the political animal also favors the ability to review human actions, conducts and behaviors in order to give each person what he deserves, being significant to identify in this virtue the call to assume the consequences derived from irresponsibility with respect to the non-commitment or permanent care of the environment. which translate into legal and juridical sanctions, but in the face of the experience of a conscious and reflective exercise of care for the environment, it must transcend mere sanctions in order to constitute a discipline or way of life capable of preserving nature, and with it its own existence.

This is how, being fair with himself, the human being manages to be fair with others and with the responsible treatment of the other, reflecting courage (courage), temperance and in turn the moderation of which Aristotle expresses that the first allows us to face danger, the second helps in overcoming pleasures and, therefore, the moderation that is the right mean (*mesótes*) represents the balance that is sought through right reason and prudence.

It should be noted that the exercise of the ethical virtues linked to the principle of responsibility allows us to deduce the possibility of achieving not only balance but also happiness, since being able to enjoy a healthy environment through which one can develop one's existence in fullness and completeness, is not only what is sought today but also what is desired with respect to future generations in terms of the intention that they inhabit a space with the necessary and sufficient resources to develop life in an integral and dignified way.

In the words of Aristotle (2018) it is recalled that:

That the happy man lives well and does well, for it is said that it comes to be a good life and good conduct. It is clear, moreover, that what we have said includes all the requirements of happiness. (...). Our reasoning agrees with those who say that happiness consists in virtue, or in a certain virtue, since activity according to it belongs to virtue. (...), So also the beautiful and good things in life are attained only by those who act rightly, and their life is pleasant in itself. (1099a, p. 10).

It is said, then, that it is not only a matter of seeking human responsibility as a way of applying punishments and legal consequences, but that - as already said above - this principle is linked to the experience of all the ethical virtues that must be taught not only to children and adolescents in the different training scenarios (home, school and society), but it is a task that touches all people (adults and older adults), also impacting from the scenarios of technical, technological, professional/university training and including the different fields of work, since knowledge and care for the environment must constitute a teaching that transforms the way of

thinking and that manages to modify the way of life, constituting the ethics of environmental responsibility based on Aristotelian virtue as an example to follow, but no less important, in a way of being and being, or in a way of inhabiting the world from significant intellectual contributions that serve to build and not to destroy.

With regard to technology, science and even artificial intelligence so fashionable today, responsibility must lead us to take on challenges that allow us to understand our role as political and ethical agents. In this sense, these technological tools should be a way to find efficient solutions to current problems and should not necessarily constitute problems that threaten or put at risk the resources we have and that serve as a guarantee for the development of our lives.

In short, man must reconcile with himself in order to worry about and take care of his living space, doing pedagogy and introjecting into his daily life the ethical virtues suggested by Aristotle as a way to achieve the right mean and happiness, which in any case do not translate into the possession or accumulation of objects or the enjoyment of pleasures. much less in the debauchery that characterizes the licentious man, quite the opposite, in a culture of life that highlights the ideal of *Spoudaios*, which reflects the conscience, knowledge, will, ethical duty of care and responsibility of a human being who must act under the guidance of two roles, namely: *as a father / mother of a family and as a ruler, both responsible in their roles.*

The foregoing, given that (...) "Education has, in terms of its content, a certain goal – the independence of the individual, which essentially includes the capacity for responsibility – and once achieved (or attributable to the individual) it has a determined end in time" (Jonas, 1995, p. 185). In effect, it is the task of the father / mother of the family and the governed – *in both different but complementary contexts* – to struggle with the search for an exercise that favors autonomy, since the constant "loss of autonomy suffered by the individual due to the factual and psychological pressure of the technological order on the masses" (Jonas, 1995, p. 272), and therefore, this loss constitutes a threat from which a struggle against ignorance, laziness and/or ignorance is deduced, becoming a greater challenge of care and ethical responsibility today.

In fact, not only does it seek to minimize or solve a series of environmental problems that affect life, but it also seeks to help man to be more aware of his role in this game that is identified as unbalanced due to forgetfulness or little interest in exercising the ethical virtues that allow harmonizing his actions as manifestations of respect, conservation, well-being, protection and environmental responsibility, with oneself, with others and with the other.

References

1. Aponte, C. (2016). Ethics, Global Warming and Health: Part I. *INHRR*. 47(1).136-142. http://ve.scielo.org/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0798-04772016000100010
2. ARISTOTLE. (1987a). *About generation and corruption*. (Trans. Ernesto La Croce). Madrid: Ed. Gredos.
3. ARISTOTLE. (1987b). *Short treatises on natural history*. (Trans. Ernesto La Croce). Madrid: Ed. Gredos.
4. ARISTOTLE. (2018). *Nicomachean Ethics*. (Trans. María Araujo and Julian Marías). Madrid: Ed. Centro de Estudios Políticos y Constitucionales.
5. ARISTOTLE. (2011a). *Eudemian Ethics*. (Trans. Julio Pallí Bonet). Barcelona: Ed. Gredos.
6. ARISTOTLE. (2011b). *Magna Moralia*. (Trans. Teresa Martínez Manzano). Madrid: Ed. Gredos.
7. ARISTOTLE. (2011c). *Poetics*. (Trans. Teresa Martínez Manzano). Madrid: Ed. Gredos.
8. ARISTOTLE. (2007). *Metaphysics*. Madrid: Ed. Gredos.
9. ARISTOTLE. (2008). *Politics*. Madrid: Ed. Gredos.
10. National Constituent Assembly. (1991). *Political Constitution of 1991*. Bogotá: Ed. TEMIS.
11. Burgui, B. M. (2015). Hans Jonas: conservation of nature, conservation of life. *Bioethics Notebooks*. XXVI. <http://aebioetica.org/revistas/2015/26/87/253.pdf>
12. Camacho, V. D., & Chávez, R. B. (2023). The biocentric theory as a protective foundation of nature in economic activity. *Law Review*. (39). 7-23. <https://www.redalyc.org/journal/900/90075141002/html/>
13. FAO. (1996). What is the environment? In: <https://www.fao.org/4/w1309s/w1309s09.htm>
14. Gadamer, H. G. (1998). *Truth and Method II*. Salamanca: Ed. Follow me.
15. Garcés, G. L., & Giraldo, Z. C. (2014). Ethical virtues in Aristotle: reason for desires and their actions to achieve them. *Virtual Magazine*. Universidad Católica del Norte, 41, 70-78. <http://revistavirtual.ucn.edu.co/index.php/RevistaUCN/article/view/466/988>
16. Garcés, G. L. (2015). Aristotelian virtue as a path to human excellence and the actions to achieve it. *Philosophical Discussions*. Year 16. (27). 127 – 146. <http://www.scielo.org.co/pdf/difil/v16n27/v16n27a08.pdf>

17. Hernández, S., Fernández, C., & Baptista, L. (2014). *Research methodology*. Mexico. Ed. McGraw-Hill.
18. Jonas, H. (1995). *The principle of responsibility*. Barcelona: Ed. Herder
19. Jonas, H. (2000). *The Life Principle: Towards a Philosophical Biology*. Madrid: Ed. Trotta
20. Marcos, A. (2018). Sustainable happiness. Sustainable human development and the Aristotelian theory of happiness. <http://www.fyl.uva.es/~wfilosof/webMarcos/textos/Textos2019/Alcala.pdf>
21. Martínez, B. J. (2016). Aristotelian ethics and technological civilization. *Philosophia. Journal of Philosophy*. 76(2). 65-81. <https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/6039/603966971004.pdf>
22. UN. (2015). Sustainable Development Goals. In: <https://www.un.org/es/impacto-académico/page/objetivos-de-desarrollo-sostenible>
23. Pérez, R. N., & Oviedo, Á. V. (2019). Environment, urban environment and Public Administration. *University of Havana*, (287), 175-184. <http://scielo.sld.cu/pdf/uh/n287/0253-9276-uh-287-175.pdf>
24. Petticrew, M., & Roberts, H. (2006). *Systematic reviews in the social sciences: A practical guide*. Oxford
25. Vargas, C. R. (2008). Elements for the consideration of an environmental ethics. *Revista Espiga*. (16).161-188. <https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/4678/467847230011.pdf>