

Ecological crisis, evolutionary theory, “market” economy and alienation

Mikhail B. Konashev

St.-Petersburg Branch, Institute of the History of Science and Technology,
Russian Academy of Sciences

mbkonashev@mail.ru

1. One of the most urgent, difficult and not solved problems of modern mankind is a global ecological crisis. One can say that modern western civilization with “market” economy as its basis is responsible for ecological crisis. “Market economy” directly and closely connected with the liberalism which is its ideology. According to liberalism, it is enough to give to people freedom to compete with each other and then society will be prospering and peaceful. The liberalism claims that all people are selfish and seek to receive from free competition and the market at most of advantages and profit, but the market is such that even immoral actions of people bring benefit to all of society. The liberalism insists that freedom of the competition, market and a private property indispensable condition of which now is a mass production and a mass consumption giving mass waste, and this precisely correspond to human nature. Emphasizing and even sticking out the rights of people, the liberalism pays almost no attention to their responsibility and duties. The liberalism assumes that all values can be equally measured by money or are reduced to money. Many modern economists seriously claim that the environment can be protected well only by means of the measures available of modern “market” economy. Therefore it is enough to establish the “market” price for pollution, and the problem of pollution will be quickly and effectively solved. It is enough to employ experts, to pay them money, and then scientists and engineers will solve all problems, including ecological.

After the West has won a victory in Cold War, capitalism, “market” economy and a “market” way of production gained more and more global character, and as a result an ecological crisis became more and more global and deep. Therefore domination of global capitalism is the main and true reason of global ecological crisis.

2. It is known long ago that the purpose of “market” economy is to get a profit. Ecological crisis is the consequence of a capitalist way of production, and it consists in a contradiction between the mechanism of reproduction of the biosphere, i.e. biosphere “economy”, and the mechanism of reproduction of human society, i.e. modern “market” economy. Both in practice, and in the theory, the nature and the man are not the purpose, and even are not a priority of such economy. The nature and the man are always and only tools in such economy. The man is the labor creating the surplus value and making profit or the

consumer used for sale of goods and getting the same profit. The nature is either material, or a resource, that is the instrument of getting of a profit.

One of, perhaps, most demonstrative example is a water problem in California. Let me cite some passages from one of articles about this problem written by Ellen Brown.

“Wars over California’s limited water supply have been going on for at least a century”. Now “It’s the people against the new “water barons” – Goldman Sachs, JPMorgan Chase, Monsanto, the Bush family, and their ilk – who are buying up water all over the world at an unprecedented pace”.

“At a news conference on March 19, 2015, California Senate President Pro Tem Kevin de Leon warned, “There is no greater crisis facing our state today than our lack of water.”

Jay Famiglietti, a scientist with NASA’s Jet Propulsion Laboratory in La Cañada Flintridge, California, wrote in the Los Angeles Times on March 12th:

Right now the state has only about one year of water supply left in its reservoirs, and our strategic backup supply, groundwater, is rapidly disappearing. California has no contingency plan for a persistent drought like this one (let alone a 20-plus-year mega-drought), except, apparently, staying in emergency mode and praying for rain. . . .

Meanwhile, alternatives for increasing the water supply rather than fighting over limited groundwater resources are not being pursued. Why not? Skeptical observers note that water is being called the next commodity boom. Christina Sarich asserts:

Numerous companies are poised to take advantage of the water crisis. Instead of protecting existing water supplies, implementing stricter regulations, and coming up with novel ways to capture rainwater, or desalinizing seawater, the corporate agenda is ready to make trillions off your thirst. . . .

The World Bank recently adopted a policy of water privatization and full-cost water pricing. One of its former directors, Ismail Serageldin, stated, “The wars of the 21st century will be fought over water.”

Another example of the water problem is Aral Sea new problems which are direct or indirect consequences of “saving” Aral Sea by the “market” economy and policy tools. Using of these tools resulted in development of ecological, demographic and even economic crises in Aral Sea region (see pictures at attached files).

At last, third example of the water problem is Volga river and Baikal lake water problem. The quality of water in Volga and in Baikal has deteriorated from year to year.

The same mechanism of “market economy” operates also in all situations when nature have been replaced by “artificial nature” that is the set of different environments from house to city, from car to airplane and from parks to small and large water reservoirs made by man.

Usually some serious accidents with these artificial environments are named technogenic catastrophes. In many cases technogenic catastrophes are connected and connect or combined in one way or another with crises of the environment. In all or almost in all cases technogenic catastrophes are caused finally by “market” economy.

The most evident and shocking recent example of such technogenic catastrophe is the fire in shopping and entertainment center “Winter cherry” in Kemerovo which is a half-million city in the east of Russia and in the center of Siberia. As a result of the fire on March 25-26th, 2018 60 people, including 41 children have died. The fire became the second to the largest in the history of modern Russia on number of the victims after the fire in the Perm night club “Lame horse” in 2009 in which 156 people have died. In both cases causes of fire were the same.

According to the official investigations the probable cause of fire was one of following: a careless handling of fire, a short circuit of an electrical wiring, and an arson. But final causes are another. The “Winter cherry” as well as “Lame horse” has been constructed and used with many violations of the law and fire safety regulations. The owner of “Winter cherry” is the Kemerovo Confectionery Plant company, one of the enterprises of the billionaire Denis Shtengelov. The tenant of the third and fourth floors, where there was a fire, was the Winter Kemerovo Cherry company the owner of which was Nadezhda Suddenok, the local businessman and the ex-deputy of Topkinsky district of the Kemerovo region from party “Edinaya Rossiya”[United Russia].

The cofounder of the Perm’ night club “Lame horse” Anatoli Zack has been detained at night in attempt to leave Perm region on a post of traffic police on border of Sverdlovsk region. He had the Israeli passport that has given a reason to suspect him of intention to depart abroad from the Ekaterinburg airport. Anatoli Zack's property has been estimated by court at 62 million US dollars. Other cofounder and the tenant of “A lame horse” Alexander Titlyanov has been in a serious condition transported in the Moscow hospital, on December 7 where he has transferred clinical death and has died on December 9.

3. Furthermore, “market” economy produce permanently and inevitably an alienation of man. Marx wrote about the alienation of man of himself and of his human essence. It means also the alienation of man of nature. Any animal and man when he was yet an animal are parts of nature, they coincide with it in their living activity. Even in so called primitive or more exactly in nonmarket societies man still coincide with nature although not always and not in all cases, and coincide mostly or entirely because he depends of nature absolutely. Under this conditions his activity and his mode of production has to be included in that ecosystems of nature in which he exist and the part of which he is. He is not able to survive in case of any serious damage of these ecosystems caused by him. That is why all culture of such built-in-nature human societies have a set of rules of human activity prevented any activity which upset a harmony with nature.

The “market” economy caused the power of “market” and an alienation of man. Under these conditions dictated by “market” economy and “market” police the grow of human power and commodities cause only the grow of alienation.

4. Thus, the very existence of the man and the nature, the continuation and development of them unambiguously demand a new theory and practice of economy which will be in harmony with the man and the purpose of the man as the individual and as societies. Therefore transformation of the theory and practice of “market” economy into the theory and practice of truly human, and so, moral economy is necessary.

The new human economy is necessary also because the problem of alienation can not be resolved in principal through and in the framework of “market” economy and capitalist society. You can buy a place for your living in ecologically pure area, but you can not buy your true, real and active unity with the nature. Simply because in this case you are still a customer and have no inner and close bond with nature except you wish to live in (?) nature and enjoy a view of nature. Even in this case the aim of you activity is yourself, your wish, and not nature. Even if you love nature you activity is only subjenctive and not connected directly with nature, with your existence. And your existence and sense of your being is not connected with existence and sense of nature.

Man behave himself everywhere and always as a customer and as in global supermarket. He doing everything only according to “market”rules. So one can say about true, real and poweful “markert” totalitarism. At first glance man is free: he can do anything at nature and with nature, but this is not true freedom, this is indeed a whimsy and a stupidity or even wrose, a some kind of despotism.

One of examples known to everyone in Russia: rubbish and garbage at streets and beaches, and piles of town refuse and debris in forest near Saint-Petersburg (see pictires at attached files). But one can see just the same picture and may be even worse in some other countries. In the US, for instance, one can see a household rubbish along the East railways (New-York – Washington, etc.)

5. The new human economy is not only necessary, and it is not only a moral imperative. It is a result of the historical development of humankind, a new natural and objective stage of a social evolution that is the evolution of man as a self-productive force.

The concept “evolution” is usually applied to the description and understanding of biological evolution, and the term “evolutionary theory” means as a rule or almost only the theory of biological evolution. But along with biological evolution there is a social evolution including evolution of economy which has certain stages and which can be adequately understood and explained only with the corresponding evolutionary theory. The general principle

for both theories is the principle of evolutionism from which follows that in any evolution the previous stage is replaced by the subsequent one. According to this principle the modern “market” economy inevitably has to be transformed and replaced with the following, more developed stage, or as well as in biological evolution on the contrary, regressive one which is, of course, extremely undesirable. The reality confirms this assumption: “market economy” changed in the course of its evolution too, and “the market economy” at the beginning of the 21st century is not identical and considerably differs from “market economy” at the beginning of the 20th century and is even more different from “market economy” at the beginning of the 19th century when it existed and functioned only in several West-European countries.

Some of main founders of the modern theory of biological evolution, such as Julian S. Huxley and Theodosius Dobzhansky, claimed in the middle of the last century that the man, being earlier only an object of evolution, now already became its subject, the creator. From their point of view the man is already faced with the task of the management of evolution and he is alone responsible for his own evolution and for the evolution of the whole world available to him, and first of all he is responsible for the evolution of biosphere. At present one can add that he is responsible for the evolution of a near outer space too. Therefore the new post-market and post-economic way of production can be briefly defined as the reproduction of the biosphere including the reproduction of the man himself which is operated and directed by him.

What new human economy can be and have to be? Is there the theory of this economy? Or, may be, are there several and different such theories? At last, perhaps, there was already such human economy in reality in past, and there is such human economy in present. One can suppose we have positive answers to all these questions. But these answers, probably, need some important details and additional explanations.

New human economy existed already in the Soviet Union, East European and other socialist countries, but, of course, it existed in very initial, an embryonic stage. However, one of achievement of the Soviet Union was a large system of different natural reserves: forest reserves, protection forests, etc. Bulgaria in socialist period of its history produced tomatoes and some other vegetables for Bulgarian people, for people in other East European and in Soviet Union, and there was almost no ecological problems. Now Bulgaria buy tomatoes, and several regions of Bulgaria are empty, and at the same time ecological problems are serious.

6. Surely somebody has some strong and valid objections to a suggestion made above. One of this is that there was a lot of ecological problems in the USSR. Some ecological problems at West were resolved successfully.

Soviet Union had to survive in hostile political and military surroundings. Almost during whole its existence Soviet Union had to cut down expenses, and resolving of environmental or so

called ecological problems was among them. Besides there was a gap between problems which had to be solved and tools which could be used for this.

In the West many environmental problems were solved only temporarily and caused often new problems or they were solved at the expense of other problems, groups of people and countries, or at last they were resolved by tools which were already only partially “market economy” tools.

In Germany, for example, the first program of environment protection has been adopted almost half of century ago, in the beginning of 1971. According to several points of the program the German state accounted for the protection of environment.

In 1994 principal aims in the field of environmental protection have been enshrined in the main law of the country. The law red: “The government of the country is obliged to care for preservation and enhancement of natural resources by realization of legislative bases through executive judicial authority which has to work for the benefit of compliance with law. These actions are necessary for granting heritage to future generations”.

At present Germany fights for preservation of natural conditions by means of four principles. First principle is an indemnity for the whole volume of environmental damage to the state by payments of certain sums. Second one is an active prevention of environmental damage which consists in regular public meetings at which sensitive issues of preservation of ecology are brought up. Thirdly the state tries to attract the maximum of public representatives to the solution of the problems connected with an ecological subject. At last fourthly all political levels are involved in realization of the previous three principles in this or that way.

7. The alienation would be resolved already in the process of the origin of new human economy. The transformation of the theory and practice of “market” economy into the theory and practice of truly human, and so a moral economy is especially important because only through such transformation the problem of alienation can be resolved properly and sufficiently. In the course of this process man also transforms himself of capitalist economical or “market” man and of pre-human being into true real human being. Thus an alienation is eliminated at all and forever. Under conditon of really public nature of labour and its products in the form of productions and production infrastructure, man owing to public, joint, and universal in essence, cumulative labour, is released for a universal free activity. Then each man can really participate in government. He acts as the thinking person and as the material subject of production on the whole state and on the whole reproduction of the humankind. Thus, each man in his cogitative and material activity unites and coincides with all other people, with the mankind, and, thereby, create himself to the genuine, versatile and universal person, to *Homo sapiens et humanus*.