Ecological Enlightenment: Unravelling The Philosophical Depths Of Sustainable Development

Pranab Kirtunia

Assistant Professor, Department of Philosophy, Bejoy Narayan Mahavidyalaya, Itachuna, Hooghly-712147, West Bengal, India.

Abstract

"Ecological Enlightenment: Unravelling the Philosophical Depths of Sustainable Development" embarks on a profound exploration at the intersection of philosophy and sustainability. Tracing the historical journey from ancient civilizations' cosmic ideologies to contemporary ethical debates, this study dissects humanity's evolving relationship with progress and nature. Delving into the philosophies of renowned thinkers like Plato, Aristotle, Kant, and Hegel, it examines the tension between sustainability and development across different eras.

This article highlights the integration of ethical theories—utilitarianism and deontology—with sustainable development, spotlighting their impact on societal welfare and moral obligations. Emphasizing holistic environmental ethics, particularly the ecocentric perspective, it illuminates the intricate framework that shapes sustainable development's philosophical landscape.

Through a multidisciplinary lens, this work scrutinizes moral imperatives within sustainable practices. It intricately weaves philosophical principles with environmental challenges, advocating for ethical responsibility among individuals, societies, and global entities. Ultimately, the article inspires active engagement with ethical dilemmas and philosophical inquiries, encouraging collective efforts toward a more balanced, ethical, and sustainable future for our planet.

Keywords: Sustainable Development, Environmental Ethics, Moral Responsibility, Holism, Utilitarianism.

Introduction

The exploration of sustainable development from a philosophical standpoint unveils a rich tapestry woven across ancient civilizations to the modern era, drawing upon diverse ideologies and ethical theories. Ancient societies, epitomized by the Jews and further expanded upon by Greek thinkers like Plato and Aristotle, envisioned sustainability within the cosmic order, emphasizing the intrinsic connection between limits and the creation of the universe. This ancient wisdom laid the foundational principles for sustainable growth, rooted in moderation and interconnectedness.

However, despite the evolution of thought across history, a notable research gap exists in the comprehensive understanding of how philosophical ideologies have shaped and continue to influence contemporary discussions on sustainable development. While transitions from Christian theology to the

philosophical contributions of Descartes, Kant, Hegel, and others have been studied, the explicit connections between these transitions and the emergence of sustainable development as a philosophical discourse remain inadequately explored.

Furthermore, while utilitarianism and deontology, as normative ethical theories, undeniably impact sustainable development, the nuanced interplay between these ethical frameworks and the practical application within sustainable practices lacks detailed investigation. Understanding how ethical theories inform decision-making in the context of sustainability remains a notable gap in the current body of research.

Moreover, the emergence of holistic environmental ethics, especially the ecocentric perspective, marks a significant turn in framing the philosophical underpinnings of sustainable development. However, the extent to which these philosophical perspectives have been integrated into practical approaches for achieving sustainability, along with their effectiveness, demands deeper scrutiny.

This article aims to bridge these gaps by delving into the intricate relationship between philosophical ideologies, ethical theories, and the conceptualization of sustainable development. By elucidating these connections, the article seeks to provide a comprehensive understanding of the philosophical roots underlying contemporary approaches to sustainability. Ultimately, it strives to underscore the critical role of philosophical inquiry in steering humanity towards a more ethical, balanced, and sustainable future.

Ancient Greek Philosophical Foundations of Sustainability

The foundations of sustainable development are the pursuit of widespread prosperity and the establishment of a stable, developed and harmonious society. Such a broad perspective is compatible with conventional conceptions of sustainable development. However, ancient and contemporary philosophers considered the tension between sustainability and development a major philosophical debate. When one considers that human cognition is only conceivable due to our capacity to act on differences and construct boundaries between relatively distinct concepts, the essence of sustainable development becomes evident. The origins of sustainable development can be traced back to ancient societies that understood the universe's creation as the establishment of a cosmic order that contained the endless primordial chaos. The ancient Jews believed that the limit of sustainability, along with letters and numbers, was one of the three underlying principles of reality. The ancient Jews may have believed that Yahweh limited the scope of his divine nature in order to create the universe. The existence of the world is akin to the existence of God. It is believed that God does not create the world from anything when he fashions it within the limits of his existence.

Additionally, this concept of divine creation is consistent with the Christian theology of creation, which holds that the universe was formed from nothing (ex nihilo). About ex nihilo, it is mentioned that "ex nihilo means there was nothing outside of God in existence prior to the act of creation."[1] Only the Greeks understood the imperative of sustainable growth among all ancient civilisations. When the barrier (peras) restrains the primal infinite (apeiron) and the evolution of space becomes plausible, an orderly and enduring universe (cosmos) is established, according to the majority of Greek thinkers. As a result of the limiting apeiron (growth), the Greeks viewed sustainability as a connection or junction between limits and the infinite, i.e., sustainability. The concept of sustainable development (arche) can be found in the works of every ancient Greek philosopher, but mainly among the pre-Socratics. Plato (428- 348BCE) and Aristotle

(384--322 BC) conceive of being as the consequence of the interaction between the finite and the infinite or as steady progress.

Respecting the ethical territory's (ethos) boundaries is viewed as a good deed by the Greeks. Thus, legal conduct does not transcend legal boundaries (nomos). Plato and Aristotle foresaw constraints on population, land size, and sustainability, which were subsequently implemented by the architects of ideal or analogous actual city-states. One of the four traditional Greek characteristics, moderation (sphrosun), was inextricably linked to an individual's capacity to respect boundaries and ensure sustainability. Moderation was regarded as one of the essential qualities of a good leader. Plato described justice as the appropriate proportions of the other three virtues: wisdom (sophia), courage (andreia), and moderation (moderation), relating the virtue of justice (dikaiosun) to the concept of sustainability (sphrosun). Similarly, Aristotle views moral grandeur as a reasonable, permanent middle ground between the extremes of evil and good.

Early Christian theologians established the concept of God's transcendence and his created world during the transition from the ancient to the Middle Ages by addressing the insurmountable barrier between God and his creatures. In the modern era, mainly since the rise of Descartes (René Descartes: 1596--1650), there has been an effort to establish a clear separation between unquestionably true, enduring knowledge and all other information that is insufficiently dependable, dynamic, and unpredictable. Numerous philosophers, notably Descartes, endeavoured to improve the usefulness and durability of thought by limiting it to a theory. Later, Kant (Immanuel Kant: 1724–1804) stressed the issue of persistent, insurmountable cognitive limitations. His argument asserts that thinking is capable of raising challenging philosophical problems, not due to a lack of proof but rather due to the nature of thought. On the basis of synthesis, Hegel's (Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel: 1770--1831) dialectic approach, which is based on the triangle of thesis-antithesis-synthesis, can be interpreted as an attempt to at least partially transcend the contradiction between development and sustainability. Charles Darwin's (1809--1882) theory of evolution eliminates previously insurmountable barriers between species by enshrining a concept of biological species evolution that is both consistent and fluid through time. Nietzsche (Friedrich Nietzsche; 1844–1900) is typically associated with opposition toward rationalism and, by extension, the concept of sustainable development.

Psychoanalysis was one of the first fields to study the Id, Ego, and Superego levels of personality. At the turn of the 20th century, researchers also looked at the subject's mental stability and integrity, the fundamental distinctions between the many psyche layers, and a brand-new split between consciousness and the subconscious. Carl Jung (1875--1961) raised these concerns for the first time in the early twentieth century. Husserl (Edmund Husserl: 1859--1938) strives, albeit more sophisticated than Descartes, to locate continuity between absolute obviousness and derived implicit knowledge. This is the region where one can find security and stability. In Heidegger's philosophy, his conclusions regarding the nature of language and its function as a home shed light on the challenges associated with forwarding mobility and sustainability. Language has the capacity to both reveal and conceal certain information, including the reason for our continued existence. By giving us a worldview, language places us in a condition of comfort whose growing boundaries match our limitations as language-based beings.

Furthermore, Heidegger emphasises the impermanence of man to such a degree that, in his philosophy, death looks impenetrable as the ultimate end of human life and the horizon of sustainability. Sartre (Jean-Paul Sartre: 1905--1980) starts by looking into the idea that man has complete freedom as a source of his continued growth and as a project of his ongoing creation and realisation. However, he

constructs such tight, impenetrable barriers between individuals that human liberty is viewed as imprisonment — the liberty of an individualist incapable of love.

The intellectual tenets of postmodernism were particularly influential over the last three decades of the twenty-first century. Postmodernism, particularly its more militant manifestations, began to fail in traditional metaphysics and in thinking against the essential aspects of thought that are preoccupied with locating limits. Postmodernism promotes major transgression beyond social norms and has resulted in the termination of all social discussion and the imprisonment of individuals and particular social and cultural groups in all their diversity. New artificial barriers were established to eliminate the limitations imposed by tradition and classical thought, further splitting and twisting individuals and institutions. Postmodernism has made individuals more vulnerable, alienated, and dependent by emphasising autonomy at all costs. In recent years, philosophers have criticised the modernist worldview. As a result of philosophy's historical tendency to disregard the natural world, many different ethical systems have emerged that put humans at the centre of their focus. Within the constraints of this system, a worldview based on the moral principles of holism arises.

Utilitarian and Deontological Theories impact sustainability.

Sustainability considerations are intertwined with other philosophical concepts. In normative ethics, the controlling principles of existence are investigated. It investigates the underlying concepts of good and wrong behaviour and life's worth. Therefore, the normative ethical theory explores and explains fundamental moral concepts. Normative ethics logically leads to practical ethics, which entails various problems in particular spheres of human action. There are two primary types of normative theories: utilitarian and teleological or deontological. The teleological theory assumes to behave to get the best outcomes constantly. According to the principles of deontological ethics, some behaviours (such as murder, lying, stealing, etc.) are wrong in and of themselves, independent of the consequences. The most significant difference between these two normative ethical theories is whether or not good and bad behaviour is determined solely by outcomes. This is an essential normative ethical dilemma upon which approaches for addressing practical ethical dilemmas depend.

J. Bentham (Jeremy Bentham: 1748--1832) and J. S. Mill's (John Stuart Mill: 1806--1873) classical utilitarianism provided the most eloquent articulation of teleological ethics. According to this school, we should act to "maximise" the amount of joy and "minimise" the amount of suffering for all individuals whose lives are affected by our decisions. the foundation of utilitarianism is the Greatest Happiness Principle which holds that "actions are right in proportion as they tend to promote happiness, wrong as they tend to produce the reverse of happiness."[2] The utilitarians believe it is feasible to arrive at an objective morality by analysing the consequences of each action. The ethics of repercussions can appear in a variety of significant ways. There is disagreement over whether it is appropriate to choose the option that will yield the best results for oneself (egoism), for each individual involved in the situation (classical utilitarianism), or to count good solely in terms of pleasure and discomfort (hedonism), or to consider other factors. This is because what traits constitute (pluralism) is not entirely clear. When it comes to explaining the rationale behind the idea of sustainable development, utilitarian factors include the following question: Whose wellbeing do we have a responsibility to ensure: our own, the wellbeing of the group to which we belong, the wellbeing of all of humanity, or the wellbeing of all conscious beings? Again, according to hedonism, the only thing considered good is pleasure (regardless of external conditions and the results of one's actions), and suffering is the only thing considered bad.

In contrast, the notion of sustainable development, which prioritises environmental concerns over human needs, is easily consistent with utilitarian ethics. According to the utilitarian line of thinking that serves as the foundation for the concept of sustainable development, the concerns of individuals ought to take a backseat to the requirements of society as a whole. In deontological ethics, also known as the ethics of obligations, the most fundamental premise is that certain behaviours (or, more correctly, their categories) are independent of the results of those behaviours. Deontologists contend that individual values cannot be utilised to determine whether a particular course of conduct is good or bad. The idea that human morality is based on factors outside of human life has faced a lot of opposition since the dawn of the modern era. It has been stated that the individual's right to autonomy is the only rational and comprehensible foundation of morality. This methodology originates from the philosophical writings of Michel de Montaigne (1533--1592) and reaches its pinnacle in the treatises written by Immanuel Kant, which extend notions and construct a deontological ethics legacy. Deontologically speaking, we are not accountable for necessarily awful outcomes, and as a result, we are not accountable for intention. In contrast to the ethics of non-consequence, certain behaviours could be considered morally permissible even if they are not the most effective option. Deontologists believe that doing the Right thing should take precedence above doing the Good thing. Regardless of the Good that would follow from performing a deed, such deed cannot be performed if it violates the right. According to Oxford dictionary of philosophy "deontological ethics Ethics based on the notion of a duty, or what is right, or on rights themselves, as opposed to ethical systems based on the idea of achieving some good state of affairs or the qualities of character necessary to live well."[3]

Deontologists believe that both good and bad actions are inherently immoral, so there is no need for the moral evaluation of good or bad actions. Deontologists often rely on tradition or their intrinsic sense of what is morally right and wrong when determining what defines fundamental evil (whose moral standing is independent of their actions). The goal of deontological morality is the avoidance of immoral behaviour. This lends credence to the view that deontology is governed by a "legalistic" understanding of morality, in which the observance of laws is a basic aspect of moral conduct. A "legalistic" approach to morality has the benefits of being straightforward, simple to maintain, placing few restrictions on privacy. If everyone takes personal responsibility and abides by A frequent categorical imperative of avoiding engaging in intentional misbehaviour and preventing environmental harm, then the traditional deontological ethical theory demonstrates that the justification for sustainable development can become a reality (Ariansen, 1993). According to Kant, a man's primary responsibility is to abide by the categorical imperative, not only because it is a precondition for human freedom and dignity but also because it is a principle of conscience. A person who adheres to the categorical imperative can achieve continuous development, exercise the freedom that transcends ordinary external conditions and stimuli and exercise the freedom that enables them to exercise freedom. Because of this ultimate objective, utilitarian theories seek to maximise overall utility and are inextricably linked to sustainable development.

Given that utilitarianism considers all humans and sometimes nonhumans as having equal utility, it is plausible to argue that we owe the same duty to future generations as we do to our own. When comparing weak sustainability to strong sustainability and determining whether or not it is possible to replace natural resources with capital made by people, a utilitarian approach would be to figure out how much it is worth. We are not discussing the necessity or the merit of preserving natural resources; instead, we are discussing non-consequentialist ethical theories. The philosophical position on sustainable development must be taken to uphold the principles of holistic environmental (ecological) ethics, one of the non-consequentialist ethical theories of sustainable development.

Sustainable Development: The Importance of a Holistic, Philosophical Approach

According to the Brundtland Report (1987), the economic, environmental, and social components of development are interconnected three primary pillars of sustainable development. The connotation that may be gleaned from the phrase "sustainable development" has become much more all-encompassing in recent years. Sustainability can be defined as "a capacity to maintain some entity, outcome, or process over time."[4]

Due to the all-encompassing nature of this concept of sustainability, it can be applied to all human endeavours. On the other hand, Shiva contends that the popular notion of sustainability is perilous because it ignores environmental boundaries and the necessity of adjusting human actions to ensure that natural systems can continue to function sustainably. In the article "Resources" Shiva said "Sustainability meaning refers to sustaining not nature, but development itself."[5] Given that natural systems are responsible for human existence and the continuation of the results of human efforts, sustainability can scarcely be addressed without an ecological perspective. Sustainable development is constrained by economic, social, and cultural factors. It is possible to characterise sustainability as a normative ethical guideline for the progression of society. The second part of the twentieth century saw the beginning of a more methodical investigation into the dynamic link between humans and their natural surroundings. This was in response to the rapidly deteriorating state of the environment. Conventional concepts of ethics were considered inadequate by the individuals who laid the groundwork for ecological ethics because they attempted to explain the connection between humans and nature. Within this framework, comprehensive knowledge of the human-nature interaction emerges, along with new ecological and ethical rules for analysing this relationship. South African philosopher Jan Christian Smuts invented the term "holism" in his 1926 article "Holism and Evolution." Holism was defined by Jan Smuts (Jan Christiaan Smuts, 1870-1950) as the "fundamental property of wholeness in the world."[6] The origin of this term is the Greek cave (as a whole). The concept of holism can be broken down into three distinct branches: ethical holism, scientific holism, and medical holism. This point of view is opposed to ethical reductionism, which equates the welfare of a species as a whole with the welfare of each member. Second, plurality in epistemology holds that understanding the parts of a whole is neither necessary nor sufficient for understanding the whole. This approach debunks the epistemological reductionism that contends we can only perceive the whole by first becoming familiar with its component pieces. The third type is called ontological or metaphysical holism. According to this guiding principle, the whole cannot exist apart from its parts. The idea of holism was first used in ecological ethics in the book *A Sand County Almanac* by Aldo Leopold in 1949. This idea places a premium on maintaining the whole system's or ecosystem's integrity and capacity for continued existence. In other words, the holistic approach is not at all anthropocentric; it considers both individual species and entire ecosystems, each of which leads an independent life and, as a result, must be taken into ethical consideration. In this sense, ecological holism can be viewed as a non-anthropocentric worldview that holds that we can identify the parts of the whole that contribute to sustainability by being aware of the entire community of life. The principle of ecological holism, to be more precise, is that we can identify the components of the whole that are in charge of preserving biodiversity. (Partridge, 1984). According to Van Steenbergen (Bart van Steenbergen), the holistic paradigm emphasises totality, the participant as opposed to the observer, process-oriented reasoning, and a link to systems theory and ecologism. Van Steenbergen wrote "a new holistic paradigm, characterised by its emphases on totality, the replacement of t e observer by the participant, thinking in terms of processes, an affinity with systems theory, and by ecologism as distinct from anthropocentrism."[7]

The natural environment possesses inherent worth. The first philosopher to articulate and defend this position was Kant. He extended this concept to intelligent, self-aware, morally responsible individuals capable of accepting moral rights and responsibilities. As a result, logic was used to determine something's intrinsic value. A central tenet of holism is that all living things have an equal right to thrive, prosper, and realise their self-realisation by participating in the even bigger self-realisation of the totality forms. This idea is that all living things have an equal right to realise their self-realisation. Biocentric egalitarianism is an integral component of this philosophical perspective. Therefore, the idea that all life on Earth should be treated equally applies to all of it. Chet A. Bowers (Chet A Bowers: 1935-2017) outlines several cultural presuppositions, which he categorises as "myths of modernity." These modernism myths have a real effect on how we interact with nature. The first is the accessibility and overconsumption of consumer goods; the second is that people are the basic social unit capable of making moral decisions; and the third is that scientific and technological advancements are constantly improving humanity's capacity to foresee and control its own future. It is evident that liberal capitalist presumptions, together with assumptions from science and religion, can permeate a person's cognitive process, limiting the integration of ecological holism into that person's worldview and daily moral behaviour. These prevalent errors that have arisen in modern times directly oppose the idea of holism. Because it prepares the way for changes affecting the entire system, it is abundantly evident that the only way to overcome this problem is to understand the notion of sustainable development thoroughly. The only way we will be able to manage environmental issues is if all economic, political, and social systems are governed in a way that stimulates the development of environmentally friendly technologies and ecologically responsible behaviour on our part. Because only then do we have a chance to actualise our goals and manage environmental issues. Therefore, it is crucial to emphasise sustainable development's ethical, ecological, and economic components. People in this modern era of globalisation are gradually becoming aware of the destructive processes associated with globalisation. They are working toward reversing these processes by developing a new vision of globalisation based on the principles of sustainable development. This revised concept of globalisation takes not only economic data into consideration but also considers social and ecological sustainability. Currently, the world's population is excessive. We run the risk of inciting a negative response if we dismiss humanity as a value both for ourselves and for others. If we continue to disrupt the natural environment, we will inevitably bring about our own extinction. The classical worldview is gradually making a comeback in the human consciousness due to the mobilisation of active change. This worldview holds that everything around us is alive and has meaning and that the environment is a subject rather than an object. This is because the traditional conception of the universe holds that the natural world should be seen more as a topic than an object. In the context of the study of sustainable development, this issue points to the reality that the material world may not be as natural as it appears; rather, it may be an artefact that humankind has fabricated. To make place for sustainable development as an alternative philosophical paradigm, people's conceptions of right and wrong must change. The idea of sustainable development may be summed up as the acceptance of a new global ethic in which economic growth and the preservation of natural environments go hand in hand with one another. The idea of sustainable development requires this new ethic. A comprehensive ethic that affirms the value of the natural system is how sustainable development is conceptualised from a moral standpoint. The sustainable development movement is based on this philosophy of development. The sustainable development movement is based on this understanding of sustainability (Holly, 2006). On both a personal and societal level, humans are continually engaged in the process of advancement or the quest of human development. As a result, the essential philosophical meaning of sustainable development is ethics that harmonises and integrates economic, sociopolitical, and ecological systems. The key to achieving sustainability is to strike a balance between economic growth and a healthy social

environment. Also, development is essential for sustainable development. Therefore, the United Nations General Assembly began negotiating the 2030 Agenda for the Sustainable Development Goal, also known as the post-2015 development agenda (SDG), which committed to "achieving sustainable development in its three dimensions—economic, social and environmental—in a balanced and integrated manner."[8] Despite this, the relationship between development and sustainability is contested. It is a widely held belief that the development of a society is directly correlated to the rate of economic growth. However, the process through which economic growth or development accelerates can harm the environment or ecosystem. Therefore, sustainability may eventually decline. According to Sharpley (Richard Sharpley: 1966-today), there may be potential negative repercussions for the waste of natural resources.

Conclusion

It's fascinating how the foundational principles of sustainable development stretch across time, drawing from ancient philosophies to contemporary ethical paradigms. Delving into ancient Jewish and Greek beliefs, Christian theology, modern philosophical movements, and ethical theories, we uncover a rich tapestry shaping our understanding of sustainability and development.

The ancient Greeks uniquely grasped the essence of sustainable growth, perceiving it as a balance between the infinite and limiting factors, defining the concept centuries ago. Their insights echo through the works of Plato and Aristotle, underlining the importance of moderation and respecting boundaries in sustaining societies.

Moving through history, from early Christian theology to modern philosophers like Descartes, Kant, Hegel, Darwin, and beyond, diverse perspectives grapple with the interplay between development and sustainability. They emphasize cognitive limitations, ethical responsibilities, and the intricate balance between growth and constraints.

Ethical theories like utilitarianism and deontological ethics have also deeply influenced the discourse on sustainability, raising questions about consequences, duty, and intrinsic values. These philosophical underpinnings offer lenses to evaluate the ethical, economic, and ecological facets of sustainable development.

Emerging ecological ethics and holistic perspectives, often challenging traditional anthropocentric views, highlight the interconnectedness of life and emphasize the intrinsic worth of the natural environment. This holistic paradigm reshapes our approach to sustainability, advocating for a balance that harmonizes economic progress with environmental preservation.

The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development encapsulates these philosophical musings, striving for a balanced integration of economic, social, and environmental dimensions. However, the contentious relationship between development and sustainability necessitates careful consideration to avoid detrimental consequences, preserving resources for future generations.

In this complex tapestry of ideas spanning ancient wisdom to modern frameworks, the essence of sustainable development remains rooted in ethical harmonization, balancing growth with ecological responsibility. These philosophical reflections provide invaluable guidance, shaping our ethical compass toward a future that sustains both humanity and the environment.

Endnotes

1. Jack, C., (2002). *The faith once for all: Bible doctrine for today,* USA: College Press Publishing Company, p.101.
2. Mill, J. Stuart., (1879). *Utilitarianism.* England: The Floating Press, p.14.
3. Blackburn, S. (2005). *The Oxford Dictionary of Philosophy* (2nd). Oxford: Oxford University Press, p.94.
4. Jenkins, W., (2009). *Berkshire Encyclopedia of Sustainability: The Spirit of Sustainability*. USA: Berkshire Publishing Group LLC, p.380.
5. Shiva, V., (2010). "Resource." *The Development Dictionary: A guide to knowledge as power*. London, New York: Zed Books, pp. 228–242, p.240.
6. Smuts, J. C., (1936). *Holism and Evolution*. New York: The Macmillan Company, p.85.
7. Steenbergen, Bart van., (1990). "Potential Influence of the Holistic Paradigm on the Social Sciences" *Futures*, vol. 22, Issue.10, pp.1071-1083, p.1071.
8. United Nations publication., (2015). *Integrating the Three Dimensions of Sustainable Development: A Framework and Tools*. Bangkok: ESCAP, UN, p.7.

References

Basiago, A. D., "Economic, social, and environmental sustainability in development theory and urban planning practice." The Environmentalist. Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers, Manufactured in the Netherlands vol. 19, 1999, pp.145–161."

Beatley, Timothy. "Environmental Ethics and the Field of Planning: Alternative Theories and Middle-Range Principles." Values and planning (Thomas, Huw). London & New York: Routledge, 2017.

Boylan, Michael ed. Environmental Ethics 2nd. UK: Wiley Blackwell 2015.

Donella, Meadows. et al.: The Limits to Growth, London: Potomac Associates, 1972.

Grober, Ulrich. "Deep roots: A conceptual history of 'sustainable development'" (Nachhaltigkeit), Berlin: WZB Berlin Social Science Center, WZB Discussion Paper, No. P 2007-002, 2007.

Jack, Cottrell. The faith once for all: Bible doctrine for today, USA: College Press Publishing Company, 2002.

Jenkins, Willis. Berkshire Encyclopedia of Sustainability: The Spirit of Sustainability. USA: Berkshire Publishing Group LLC, 2009.

Mill, John Stuart. Utilitarianism. England: The Floating Press.1879.

Schmithüsen, Franz, "Three Hundred Years of Applied Sustainability in Forestry" Unasylva -240. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Vol. 64, Issue.1, 2013, pp.3-11.

Sessions, George ed. Deep Ecology for the Twenty-first Century. Boston & London: Shambhala, 1995.

Simon Blackburn, The Oxford Dictionary of Philosophy (2nd). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Smuts, J. C. Holism and Evolution. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1936.

Steenbergen, Bart van. "Potential Influence of the Holistic Paradigm on the Social Sciences" Futures, December-1990, vol. 22, Issue.10, pp.1071-1083. United Nations. "Report of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, Stockholm, 5-16 June 1972." UN Publication, 1973.

Shiva, V. Resources. "Resource." The Development Dictionary: A guide to knowledge as power. London, New York: Zed Books, 2010, pp. 228–242.

United Nations publication, Integrating the Three Dimensions of Sustainable Development: A Framework and Tools. Bangkok: ESCAP, UN, 2015.